

5300. Also, petition of W. H. Conway, Springfield, Ill., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5301. Also, petition of Moline Kiwanis Club, of Moline, Ill., suggesting certain rules for the regulation of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5302. Also, petition of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of Chicago Heights, Ill., urging the defeat or amendment of House bill 10311; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5303. Also, petition of Dr. H. M. Richter, protesting against House bill 12644; to the Committee on Water Power.

5304. Also, petitions of Aurora Chamber of Commerce; C. E. Kremer, Chicago; North Western Tow Boat Owners' Association, Seattle, Wash.; and Quincy Chamber of Commerce, urging passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5305. Also, petition of Massey Concrete Products Corporation, Chicago, by Mr. H. W. Wilder and W. H. Miner, Chicago, urging support of House bill 1551, Winslow measure; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5306. Also, petitions of Gust Wolff, of Decatur; Hugh A. Green, of Moweaqua; and Mr. W. G. Wolff, of Decatur, all in the State of Illinois, urging the passage of the Elkins bill (S. 4596); to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 27, 1921.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The unfinished business, House bill 15275, is before the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I was interrupted on yesterday, and I wish to present this morning two or three matters that I would otherwise have presented at that time.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would prefer to present these papers before a call for a quorum.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like a full Senate to hear the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that the Senator from Georgia has the floor, and unless the Senator yields for that purpose the Senator from Pennsylvania can not suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand that, without the reminder of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I prefer not to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is unfortunate that all the Senators do not hear the resolutions I am about to read, but they will go into the Record, and I hope they will be read there.

The bill to create the department of education is commonly known now as the Smith-Towner bill. I having introduced it in the Senate, and Judge TOWNER having introduced it in the House. I mention that fact because the resolutions I am about to read commend the Smith-Towner bill. I wish it understood that they commend, therefore, the bill to create a department of education, the authority to make appropriations for educational purposes contained in that bill.

The first is from St. Petersburg, Fla., where there is a large gathering of winter tourists. I wish to read their letter first:

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., January 20, 1921.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The St. Petersburg Republican Club, 800 members, unanimously went on record as indorsing the passage of the Smith-Towner bill, and instructed the secretary to so inform you. Fight for it to the finish.

Respectfully, yours,

H. L. ERMATINGER, Secretary.
A. R. WELSH, President.

Again, I read:

ST. PETERSBURG SHRINERS' ASSOCIATION,
St. Petersburg, Fla., January 14, 1921.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The St. Petersburg Shriners' Association, composed of Shriners representing 88 temples, from 88 cities throughout the United States, unanimously indorse the passage of the Smith-Towner bill. These 88 temples, such as Lu Lu, Philadelphia; Al Koran, Cleveland; Aladdin, Columbus, Ohio, and the 85 others, have a membership of over 1,000,000 of the best men in the United States, and their winter representatives in St. Petersburg have just gone on record as above stated.

Yours, truly,

H. L. ERMATINGER, President.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has approved the bill creating a department of education, and I wish to bring the letter of their president to the attention of the Senate, and also in that way to the attention of the country.

"Educational crisis national problem," says Joseph H. Defrees.

President of United States Chamber of Commerce says conditions in public schools contribute to unrest.

Statement of Joseph H. Defrees, president United States Chamber of Commerce:

Educational authorities who have carefully studied conditions estimate that of the 600,000 public-school teachers in the United States:

One hundred thousand are under age 21.

Thirty thousand have no education beyond the eighth grade.

One hundred and fifty thousand have no education beyond the third year in high school.

Four hundred and eighty thousand—four-fifths of the total—have not had two years of special training, the minimum recognized standard in other civilized countries.

Forty thousand temporary teachers who have not even fulfilled our own low educational requirements.

"Washington—Conditions in our public schools undoubtedly contribute much to unrest in this country to-day," said Joseph H. Defrees, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in a statement made public to-day to a representative of the National Education Association.

Mr. Defrees said that the situation had become so serious that it could no longer be looked upon as a matter of purely local interest, but should be treated as a national issue to be solved through the full cooperation of State and Nation.

Nothing in our national life is more important than the fullest and best facilities for the education of our children.

One reason why radicalism has not made the same headway in the United States that it has in Europe is the fact that hundreds of men, occupying positions of the greatest importance in this country, began life as poor boys—

Said Mr. Defrees—

But what have we got to say of the inequalities in education?

Eighteen thousand classrooms in this country are said to have stood idle last year through lack of teachers. Taking an average of 25 pupils to each classroom, that means that 450,000 children were either denied education altogether or crowded into other classrooms where they were given such education as they could get from an overworked, underpaid, undertrained teacher.

The balance of the letter I am perfectly willing to print without reading. I ask unanimous consent to print it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The remainder of the letter is as follows:

I have given some figures on this country's failure to provide trained teachers for its schoolrooms. In that regard authorities assert that we lag behind every other civilized nation, including some of our South American neighbors. In the country districts, where 60 per cent of the children of this Nation are educated, the teachers, as a group, represent by far the most immature and badly educated of all teachers. Of course, under these circumstances, the public school can not compete with the richly endowed private school, and what becomes of our boast of equal opportunity? Isn't it an obvious step in allaying present and preventing future unrest that we remove this educational handicap?

There is one other phase of this question that I wish to touch upon. Our shortsighted policy in failing to recognize the dignity of the teaching profession, in some instances, has led to a class consciousness in that profession, which has made itself felt in the classroom and left its indelible imprint upon the impressionable minds of the young. Let the facilities for the education of the teacher and compensation of the educated teacher be made ample.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall not take more time of the Senate just now to bring the subject to the attention of the Senate and the country, but as opportunity is given from day to day I hope briefly to call attention to facts that are important and pertinent, and to demonstrate to the Senate not only the necessity for the legislation but that the overwhelming support of the women and men voters of the country is behind it.

I am aware of the fact that there is a small organized opposition, an unfortunate opposition for those who are making it.

but I believe it does not represent any real majority of those from whom it seems to come. That the bill will pass at this session or in the near future I have no doubt.

ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Mr. NELSON. On account of illness in my family, I ask leave to withdraw from the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 13931) to authorize association of producers of agricultural products, and I ask that the Chair may appoint another Senator in my place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] will be excused from further service as a conferee on the part of the Senate, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in his place. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McCumber	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Hale	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harris	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Harrison	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Heflin	Myers	Stanley
Colt	Henderson	Nelson	Sterling
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Swanson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	Kellogg	Poindexter	Trammell
Elkins	Kendrick	Pomerene	Underwood
Fernald	Keyes	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Fletcher	King	Robinson	Warren
France	Kirby	Sheppard	Williams
Gerry	Knox	Sherman	Willis
Glass	La Follette	Simmons	
Gooding	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to state that the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] is necessarily absent on public business.

Mr. GERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by reason of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the passage of Senate bill 4839, to classify and provide salaries for officers and clerks of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the Rockville Chamber of Commerce, of Rockville, Conn., favoring the passage of a bill providing for a 1-cent drop-letter rate in cities, towns, and on rural routes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry Polish political, social, and beneficial organizations of the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Sunday blue laws, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution of the Stamford Central Labor Union, of Stamford, Conn., favoring the removal of trade restrictions with Russia, and also that an appropriation be made for the completion of the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions of the Hartford Central Labor Union, of Hartford, and Elm Lodge, No. 420, International Association of Machinists, both in the State of Connecticut, favoring immediate resumption of trade with soviet Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local No. 185, Federal Employees Union, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the continuance of the \$240 bonus to Federal employees during the next fiscal year, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of sundry employees of the United States customs service of New Haven and Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the salaries

of customs officers, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of the Waterbury Women's Club, of Waterbury, Conn., and the Chamber of Commerce of Norwich, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation commercializing the national parks, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KENDRICK presented a letter in the nature of a petition signed by John Hendricks and sundry other citizens of Powell, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection for the beekeeping industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PHIPPS presented telegrams in the nature of memorials of the Denver Civic and Commercial Association, of Denver; the William E. Russell Coal Co., of Denver; F. R. Wood, of Trinidad; J. S. Cheyney, vice president Canon Reliance Coal Co., of Denver; F. B. Reigart, secretary Pueblo Retail Coal Dealers' Credit Bureau, of Pueblo; the Govereau Coal & Feed Co., of Rocky Ford; and the Colorado Retail Coal Dealers' Association, of Denver, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Calder bill to regulate the coal industry, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a letter in the nature of a petition from F. Ward Deklyn, foreman of the jury in the case of United States v. Remington Arms, et al., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of United States court jurors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON) presented a letter in the nature of a petition of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co., of Fort Smith, Ark., praying for a revision of the internal revenue law as it applies to manufacturers of nonalcoholic beverages, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have a resolution passed by the legislature of my State. I am not going to ask that the resolution may be printed in the Record in full, but I am simply going to state that it is a resolution urging the passage by the Senate of the magnesite bill, one of the special tariff bills that were reported last session and are now on the calendar. I simply ask that this resolution may be noted in the Record as a petition or memorial, without asking that it be printed in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that the rules contemplate that memorials of that character shall be printed in the Record.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that the rules do contemplate it, but I do not ask it. I do not think it is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will take the course suggested by the Senator from Washington. The Chair hears no objection. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4859) for the relief of certain ex-service men whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims, reported it favorably without amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4640) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation, the development of water power, the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 724) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 238) authorizing the President to require the United States Sugar Equalization Board to take over and dispose of 13,902 tons of sugar imported from the Argentine Republic, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 725) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 4924) to retrocede to the State of Virginia exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States of America over the property and persons of the town site or territory known as United States Housing Corporation project 150-A,

located in Norfolk County, State of Virginia, and called Cra-dock; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4925) to amend an act approved February 25, 1920, entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 4926) to amend an act approved February 25, 1920, entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4927) to amend Title IX, section 900, paragraph (8) of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4928) for the purchase of the statue "The Pilgrim Mother and Child of the Mayflower," and presentation of same to the Government of Great Britain; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4929) for the relief of estates of Edwin G. Scott, Clyde R. Dindinger, and Ralph R. Fraley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4930) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell timber on certain public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4931) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior in certain cases to reconvey real property donated for use in connection with Federal irrigation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4932) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to deliver to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation, including buildings and grounds at Walla Walla, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SPENCER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15275, the emergency tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15275, the emergency tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted an amendment (with an accompanying paper) proposing to appropriate \$4,500 to pay Mrs. Anne Gale White, widow of Jay White, late consul at Naples, Italy, being one year's salary of her deceased husband, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

SHIPPING CLAIMS AGAINST THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I submit a resolution of inquiry, asking for certain information from the State Department in regard to certain claims.

The resolution (S. Res. 438) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to inform the Senate whether any, and if any what, measures have been taken relating to claims or complaints of citizens of the United States against the British Government growing out of restraints on American commerce and the alleged unlawful seizure and sale of American ships and cargoes by British authorities during the late war, and to communicate to the Senate a copy of any instructions which may have been given by the Executive to the American ambassador at London on the subject on and after October 21, 1915, and also a copy of any correspondence which may have passed between this Government and that of Great Britain in relation to that subject since that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be printed and lie over under the rule.

MARBLE BUSTS OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY AND OTHERS.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which was read and referred to the Committee on the Library:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library, acting under the authority conferred by section 1831 of the Revised Statutes, on behalf of Congress, accepts the marble busts of Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, presented to the Congress by the women of the United States, and assign to said busts a suitable place in the United States Capitol, and that appropriate ceremonies, under the supervision of the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, are hereby authorized to be held in the Rotunda of the Capitol at such time as said Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds may deem suitable.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12502) providing for a report on the cost of improving and maintaining the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of W. T. Dingler;

H. R. 4184. An act for the relief of C. V. Hinkle;

H. R. 11769. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917; and

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States, except in the case of those men who have already served one or more enlistments therein.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to state in the beginning some general propositions with reference to the pending bill, then I will enter upon a discussion of what I regard as the real issues involved in this controversy, especially from an economic standpoint.

The bill under consideration places unprecedentedly high duties upon importations of a large number of staple agricultural products of this country. Scarcely any of these duties are justified under the tariff theories of either of the two great political parties. Most of them, measured by the Republican standard of protection, are either excessive or prohibitive, and will therefore produce but little, if any, revenue for the support of the Government. Indeed, it was boldly declared in the Finance Committee when the bill was under consideration there that it was framed without regard to revenue and solely for purposes of protection.

An examination of the rates imposed by the bill in connection with this declared purpose of the legislation makes it clear that the primary object of the bill is to enhance the price in the domestic market of the several products embraced in the bill. Such a use, or misuse, of the power of taxation is repugnant to the fundamental principles and policies of the Democratic Party, and is inconsistent with and repugnant to all the theories or arguments upon which the Republican Party have heretofore attempted to justify tariff for protection.

If these rates reflect the present attitude of the Republican mind upon the question of protection and foreshadow the character and measure of protection for which that party intends to stand in the future, this bill furnishes a new and startling illustration and interpretation of a radical advance in the development of that doctrine under the present leadership and control of that party.

Mr. President, this is not the only tariff bill which will be presented to the Congress for its consideration and action in the near future. It is known that during the special session to be called, probably in April, the party in power intends to bring in a general bill revising and rewriting the tariff act now in force.

If the duties proposed in the so-called popgun bills presented to the Senate by the majority during the second session of the present Congress reflect the trend of the Republican mind in the direction of higher protection, we may expect that the rates of the promised general revision of the tariff now in process of incubation in another Chamber will be the highest protective duties ever proposed in this or any other country with the exception of China during the dark centuries of her isolation. But while the proposed general revision will undoubtedly be a distinctively protective tariff measure, it will not, we are told, as is the case in the pending bill, be framed in avowed disregard of the revenue requirements of the Government. On the contrary, we are advised that it will be framed with a view to raising between five hundred million and a billion dollars in revenue. Of course, that can not be accomplished if the duties are made prohibitive or nearly prohibitive as are many in the pending bill, unless the free list is abolished and the burdens of the Government laid upon the necessities of life; and, of course, the leadership of the Republican Party is too shrewd to go too far in that direction.

Mr. President, I mean no offense to those Democrats who intend to vote for this bill—and I know there are some who do intend to vote for it—when I say that if a Democrat votes for

the prohibitive duties in this bill, imposed without reference to revenue and for the avowed purpose of increasing domestic prices, he will find himself in an extremely embarrassing predicament a little later on when called upon to vote upon the general tariff bill to which I have just referred.

The truth is, Mr. President, that no Democrat and, I think, no Republican can justify a vote for this bill except upon the assumption that the tariff has been and is the cause of the present distressing condition of agriculture in this country and that the great slump which has taken place in the price of practically all unmonopolized products, including those of agriculture, in recent months, not only in the United States but throughout the civilized world, has been and is the result of tariffs, and that this situation can be relieved by remedial tariff legislation. Frankly, I can not understand how any intelligent man at all familiar with the situation and the effect of tariffs can arrive at such a conclusion.

The bill, therefore, to my mind, presents three questions for debate:

First, are the importations under existing tariffs the cause of the slump in the price of agricultural products embraced in this bill; and if so, will the duties prescribed by this bill materially and substantially remedy the situation by raising the price of these commodities in the domestic market?

Second, can the taxing powers of the Government be legitimately used for purposes of enhancing the price of domestic products?

And, third, will not the reflex action of the application of this supposed remedy be more harmful in its effects upon our international trade relations and upon the domestic consumer of these commodities than the prospective benefits that may be secured to the domestic producers of these products?

Mr. President, I have made these general observations for the purpose of making clear from my viewpoint the real issues involved in this proposed legislation from both a political and an economic standpoint. It is a common practice, not only in legislation but in the courts of the country, to seek sometimes to becloud the real issue involved in a controversy by a discussion of extraneous and immaterial and collateral matters, or by an exaggeration of conditions out of which the controversy arises with a view to prejudicing the decision of the real question involved in the case. We have heard and we will hear more discussion and declamation in this debate with reference to the condition of the farmer and his need, his urgent need, for some sort of relief. Nobody raises any question about the condition of the farmers of this country.

It is said that the farmer is in a desperate plight. Everybody concedes that. It is said that he has lost money upon his last year's crop. Everybody admits that. It is said that he is forced by present market conditions to dispose of his products of last year, raised at peak war prices, at less than the cost of production. Everybody admits that. It is said that his price has slumped out of proportion to other prices. Everybody concedes that; but that is not the controversy. Those things are all admitted and conceded. The real issue involved in this legislation is whether this deplorable condition, this desperate plight in which the farmers of this country find themselves to-day, has been brought about by the importations of foreign products into this market, to be sold in competition with the American farmers' products; and if so, are the conditions of production in this country such that the imposition of a high protective tariff, even to the point of prohibition or to the point of embargo, will relieve against that condition?

Mr. President, I do not think that the condition of the farmer is due, and I do not think it can be shown to be due, to importations; and I believe that a full discussion of this question as it applies to the various items in this bill will show that this condition has not been in any material way affected by importations or, if it has been, that the production conditions of this country are such that the tariff could not possibly help it.

In considering this question, however, it is very material to inquire whether the farmer is in any worse condition than possibly could be ascribed to the tariff than the balance of the business of the country. I concede, everybody admits, that the slump in agricultural prices has been somewhat out of proportion to the slump in the prices of other products; but there is no product produced in this country, unless it is under control of a monopoly with irresistible power to increase its prices or maintain its prices, that has not been affected with the same trouble with which the farmers are afflicted. If affected in less degree, the reason for the difference is very clear. The farmers, by reason of their great numbers, are not able, and despite many efforts in the past have not been able, by concert of action, by associations, by combinations, by organizations, to protect themselves against a situation of this sort as have the

other industries of the country, most of which are in some sort of association, some sort of concert of purpose, some sort of gentlemen's agreement, or some sort of combination that enables them to offer greater resistance to depression and to better protect themselves in the maintenance of their prices.

If the farmer has been first hit and hardest hit—and undoubtedly he has been—it is because he offered the least resistance; and a movement of this sort always moves upon lines of least resistance. If the others have been able to maintain their prices to some extent, to a greater extent than he, it is because they have been in a position that enabled them to offer the greater resistance. Outside of the influence of these considerations upon prices, it may be truthfully said that the other business interests of the country not monopolized—I wish that modification always to be included in my remarks—have suffered from a like depreciation in the prices of their products.

Now, Mr. President, if it be true that we have had in this country during the last five or six months a general slump in prices that has not been confined to agriculture, but has extended to every product of the country, without reference to whether or not that product is protected against importations; if the condition is general, universal, subject only to the exception of monopoly and its influence, how can it be said that the disaster which has come upon the farmer along with the balance of the country is due to the fact that there have been importations into this country to some slight extent of the things which he produces?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish the Senator would not break into my argument. I will yield later on.

Mr. KELLOGG. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, Mr. President, let us carry that argument a bit further. Is the condition which we find obtaining in the United States to-day confined to this country? Are these conditions exceptional in this country? There is not a Senator here who does not know that they are not confined to this country. There is not a Senator here who does not know that the same conditions which confront us, which confront agriculture and afflict the farmer to-day, obtain in all the leading countries of South America; that there the farmer's prices have suffered as grievous a slump as they have here; that there is the same stagnation in business in those countries as there is here.

The difference between conditions in this country and in other countries of this hemisphere in this respect is that conditions there are worse than they are here. But do not the same conditions which prevail here, and in South America, and in Canada, right across the border, prevail throughout the world to-day, and is it not a fact that there has been just as great, just as radical, and just as severe a decline in the price of agricultural and other products in Great Britain, in France, in Italy, and in all the countries of Europe, as there has been in the countries of this hemisphere?

Mr. President, the only difference, I think, is a difference in our favor, by reason of the fact that we are in a better condition to protect ourselves in the world situation which exists, because of the fact that the American dollar is at a premium as compared with the currencies of other countries. This fact has enabled us to protect ourselves to an extent that has not been possible with the other countries of the world. There is a difference in the degree of the depreciation of prices here and elsewhere, but that difference is in our favor, and not against us.

This slump in prices is universal throughout the world, without regard to differing tariff conditions which obtain in the different countries.

It applies with equal force to countries upon a low-tariff, a protective-tariff, or a free-trade basis, and that being true, it is impossible to logically or consistently contend that this slump is the result of importations from foreign countries.

I want to go back to this line of discussion a little later, but right now let me say that the next question which arises is, If we should find that prevailing low prices in this country are caused by importations, and that they can be raised by placing a bar in the future against those importations, can we, for the sole and exclusive purpose of raising the price of domestic products—not for the purpose of protecting them against a disastrous influx of foreign goods, not for the purpose of bringing about competitive conditions between foreign goods and American goods, not for the purpose of protecting this market against the disastrous and ruinous inundation of cheap foreign products, but for the purpose and the sole purpose of raising the prices of domestic products—justify ourselves in invoking the powers of taxation, especially in view of the fact that the price of a product can not be raised by taxation without increasing the price the consumer must pay?

If the tax is levied solely and exclusively for the purpose of raising the price of the product in the domestic market, is that not, by legislation, putting money into the pocket of the producer and forcing it out of the pocket of the consumer? Is it not an indirect way of confiscating the property of the one man to increase the profits of another man?

Mr. President, I say that we can not justify such a use of the powers of taxation. I know perfectly well that we can justify anything from a constitutional standpoint in the imposition of taxes under the decisions of the Supreme Court. The question whether a tax is constitutional or unconstitutional does not seem to be a question of law any longer in this country. It is purely a question which addresses itself to the conscience or the judgment of the legislative branch of the Government. But can we afford to so stretch our legislative conscience, stultify our judgment, and suppress our instincts of justice and right between man and man as to pass an act for the deliberate and avowed purpose of taking money out of one man's pocket and putting it into the pocket of somebody else, simply because that somebody else happens to be in a condition of distress?

Mr. President, there is another view to be taken of this matter.

If it shall be decided that imposing a duty upon the importations of like products into this country will lift the prices of those products, and we shall adopt and so extend that idea as to inaugurate a policy of international discrimination, a policy of prohibition, a policy of excluding, practically, as effectively as by embargo, the main products which other countries send here, especially at a time when foreign countries are utterly unable to buy our goods except by the process of exchange, when they have no gold to pay us in that metal, when our dollar is at a premium everywhere in the world, when they have no credit with which to borrow in this country, when their sole hope of buying our products, which they so much need, depends upon our buying their products and taking them in exchange, is there anybody who will deny that such a policy of legislation must inevitably lead to international retaliation?

What will our friends in Canada think of it? Last year we imported from them \$46,000,000 worth of vegetable products, and that quantity includes wheat, corn, and products of that sort. We sold them, I think, about a hundred and sixty-odd million dollars' worth of similar products. How will that country take it if we shut out our importations from Canada of these products by prohibitive duties?

The same argument that applies to Canada applies with the same force to other countries in the world. How will they look at it? What will be the effect of such a policy upon the nations of the world, especially in view of the fact that the balance of the world is not in a very good frame of mind toward the United States just at this time; in view of the fact that many of these nations think we are not doing our duty in the present world situation; in view of the fact that they think we have deserted them in their misfortunes and their extremity; in view of the fact that we have piled up here during the war, drawn from other countries, one-half of all the gold supply of the world; in view of the fact that we have developed an export trade amounting during the war to as high as \$4,000,000,000 in our favor over our imports; and even under the conditions which now exist, all adverse to our export trade, we still are drawing from the balance of the world \$3,000,000,000 every year more than we pay them, even at their present rate of imports.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. Just let me finish this, and then I will yield.

With the world mind somewhat resentful toward us, somewhat inflamed against us, do you not think, Senators, that if we shall inaugurate the policy which would be inaugurated under this bill, expand it, advance it, enlarge it, and develop it, as you probably will, in the general revision to take place a little bit later, that we are likely to excite in the countries of the world not only a spirit of retaliation but a spirit of hostility, which may do this country, in its trade relations, in its general political relations, its industrial relations, and its economic relations with the world, infinite and incalculable harm?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator with a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would beg that the Senator, if he can, postpone this question until I conclude.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not wish to disturb the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a line of argument in mind from which I do not wish to be diverted.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator called attention to the fact that some \$160,000,000 of vegetable products were exported. I wanted to know if the Senator really meant that?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have before me the statement of exports and imports of vegetable products to and from Canada. We exported to Canada of vegetable products \$184,000,000 instead of \$160,000,000, as I said, and we imported from Canada of vegetable products \$46,000,000. The Senator will find that statement in the tables of commerce under vegetable products, which includes wheat, corn, oats, and all those things.

Mr. McCUMBER. And tobacco?

Mr. SIMMONS. It includes exports of about \$400,000 of unmanufactured tobacco. It is quite a long list.

Mr. KELLOGG. It is fair to say, if the Senator will permit me, that he probably includes all products which are sent to Canada, and from Canada to foreign countries. We export a great deal through Canada to foreign countries.

Mr. SIMMONS. This is not the first time I have heard that statement made, but I think, as a matter of fact, that in recent years the bulk of Canadian wheat sold in Europe was shipped through the United States. I do not think that any considerable amount of these vegetable exports to Canada were for reexport to foreign countries.

Mr. President, I desire to confine my discussion to a consideration of what I believe to be the factors that enter into the determination of whether the proposed duties can help, and if they can help whether the situation justifies the exercise of the powers of taxation to bestow that benefit in the way proposed.

I have no disposition whatever to delay action upon the bill one minute beyond the time necessary for fair and full discussion. I believe that any Senator here will say, if he will examine the bill and take account of the sundry important propositions contained in it, that it ought not, upon any pretense of emergency, to be rammed down the throats of Senators or to be precipitately driven through this body without giving full opportunity for discussion. Not only the Senators are interested in having the facts in the matter brought out, not only are the two parties in the country interested in having the facts in the matter brought out, but the 105,000,000 people whom we represent, and whose interests will be profoundly affected by the proposed legislation, for better or for worse, are sufficiently interested in the matter to make it our duty not to try to stifle discussion, but to invite such discussion as is calculated to enlighten the minds of Senators and of the people with reference to the merits of the proposition.

Having that object in view, I shall try to confine my discussion hereafter to the provisions of the bill. I have made these general observations because I think it is very well to understand the fundamentals of the proposition before going into the details of the concrete phases of it. I shall hereafter confine my discussion of the matter to the different items in the bill and attempt to analyze as best I can the facts with reference to them and to present them to the Senate and to the country for unbiased judgment in the hope of fair and intelligent action on the part of the Senate with reference to them. The only one of the items that has been under discussion up to this time is that of wheat, and I wish to give some consideration to that and only to that item to-day.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], who is, after the chairman, the ranking Republican upon the Finance Committee, and who is largely sponsor for the legislation and for the item with reference to wheat, has contended that the slump which has taken place in the price of wheat is the result, in a large measure at least, of importations from Canada during the last crop year and especially during the three months immediately preceding the beginning of this year.

What is the wheat situation as compared to the situation of other things in the country? During the last crop year, which began last July, we produced in this country—and the Senator from North Dakota admitted it yesterday, I believe—750,000,000 bushels of wheat. According to the report of the Tariff Commission with respect to wheat, our importations from Canada of last year's wheat crop amounted to only 25,000,000 bushels to December 23, 1920.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask where the Senator got that statement of only 25,000,000 bushels being imported?

Mr. SIMMONS. I got that statement from the Tariff Commission's report.

Mr. McCUMBER. I got it from the commission but a short time ago and from the departments here, and up to about the middle of December it had run up to 58,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am speaking about exports to this country. I shall have no difficulty, I think, in that matter. Here is what the Tariff Commission says:

Exportable surplus of the United States for the crop of 1920—

Referring to wheat—

has been generally estimated to be from 200,000,000—

That is what the Senator said yesterday—

to 225,000,000 bushels, but during the first half of the crop year—July 1 to December 23, 1920, inclusive—there was exported fully 203,000,000 bushels of wheat and its equivalent in flour. Official figures for July 1 to November 30, inclusive, report exports of 175,000,000 bushels of wheat and wheat in the form of flour. Bradstreet estimates the exports during December 1 to 23, inclusive, at approximately 28,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour; and commercial sources report further heavy export buying toward the close of December for shipment in the following month.

From the table of imports and exports of wheat and from commercial estimates for the early part of December, it appears that American exports have been, roughly, 200,000,000 bushels since July 1, 1920, whereas the imports, chiefly from Canada, have been about 25,000,000 bushels in the same period.

That is the report of the commission. Now, with this enormous crop of 750,000,000 bushels, with exports reaching during the first six months of the crop year 200,000,000 bushels, can anyone believe for a minute that the importation of 25,000,000 bushels from across the border of Canada can have materially affected the price of wheat in this country or in any way accounted for the slump in the price of wheat in this country?

But, Mr. President, let us see about corn.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. Before the Senator leaves the discussion of wheat, while I do not like to interrupt him and I shall not interrupt him if it disturbs him—

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall be glad to answer any question after I conclude.

Mr. GRONNA. But this is such an important question—

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. And I know the Senator wishes to have his figures correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. How can anyone argue that we have 200,000,000 bushels or more of wheat to export when everybody knows that last year's crop amounted to but 750,000,000 bushels. It is admitted by everybody that it requires 5 bushels of wheat per capita, and as we have 105,000,000 people that means we must have 525,000,000 bushels of wheat for bread; we must also have 90,000,000 bushels of wheat for seed; there is a shrinkage of 10 per cent, 75,000,000 bushels of wheat, so that the deductions amount to 690,000,000 bushels. Now, deduct that from 750,000,000 bushels of wheat and where can one possibly get the 200,000,000 bushels for export to which the Senator from North Carolina refers?

However, let me say to the Senator, if he will pardon me, that the wheat which is shipped from Canada to milling centers and is in transit for the purpose of being manufactured is not regarded as imported wheat, because that wheat is exported to England or to other countries. I say, without the fear of successful contradiction, that if the Tariff Board has made such a report—which, of course, I am sure it has, as the Senator has read from it—the report is entirely misleading.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the reports on foreign trade statistics include the exports only to November; but they show, as I recollect, the export of 176,000,000 bushels of wheat up to the 1st of December. The report which has been made by the commission only claims that 175,000,000 bushels of wheat were exported up to that time, and adds that the statistics up to the 23d of December showed 28,000,000 bushels in addition to that, making 203,000,000 bushels.

However, I thank the Senator for the words he has uttered, because what he has said enormously fortifies the argument which I have been making. The Senator asks how can anybody claim, with a crop of wheat of only 750,000,000 bushels, considering the requirements of the domestic market, that we could export the amount of wheat which I have stated we exported. Mr. President, the fact remains that we have exported it; and if the conditions did not justify the exportation, and if, after the exportation, there is a deficiency in the markets of America, does not the Senator know that we must get the wheat to cover that deficiency of supply from somewhere else, and that in getting the wheat to cover that deficiency of supply we do not depress the market for the domestic product?

Mr. GRONNA. Where the Senator from North Carolina makes the mistake is that he includes Canadian wheat which is shipped through this country.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, no; the reports of the Department of Commerce do not show that. Whatever exports go through this country from Canada are not included in the tables of our imports from Canada nor in our exports of domestic merchandise.

The Senator from North Dakota must know that. I know that, if the Senator from North Dakota does not know it.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from North Dakota knows that the United States of America has not exported 200,000,000 bushels of American wheat during the current year.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not say we had exported that much American wheat, because if we had exported that much American wheat, I say, as the Senator has said, it would have been accomplished by drawing on the domestic supply.

I agree with the Senator from North Dakota. We exported during the first half of the crop year, up to January 1, an amount of wheat equal to the amount of our exportable surplus wheat, because, on the basis of last year's crop, we only had an exportable surplus of 200,000,000 bushels.

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, no.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from North Dakota stated that on yesterday.

Mr. GRONNA. My colleague stated it.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I mean; the Senator's colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] stated it.

Mr. GRONNA. That amount will have to include the carry over. Does the Senator from North Carolina mean to say that we are going to export every surplus bushel that we have produced and every bushel that we carried over from last year?

Mr. SIMMONS. The senior Senator from North Dakota said on yesterday that the amount of our exportable surplus wheat was 200,000,000 bushels. I say that we exported that much and a little bit more than that during the first six months of the crop year when ordinarily we have unexported about 60 per cent of the exportable surplus at the time I have indicated. The remainder is ordinarily exported afterwards.

Now, Mr. President, if we have already exported all of our surplus wheat and still have reached only halfway of the crop year, we have got to stop all exportation of wheat during this crop year, unless we increase our imports, or further draw upon the domestic supply and thereby cause a scarcity of wheat in the American market, from which market the needs of the American people are supplied. The Senator contends that if we have exported 200,000,000 bushels we have already passed that point. If we have passed that point, I say to the Senator, instead of standing here seeking to put up bars against the importation of wheat into this country, he ought to be endeavoring to make the way easier for the importation of wheat to supply the demand of consumers in this country of that indispensable product.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I have given this subject some thought.

Mr. SIMMONS. I also have given it some thought.

Mr. GRONNA. I know the Senator has; but I can not reconcile the figures which I have gone over and which have been furnished me by the various departments, based upon the crop production, with the figures presented by the Senator. I will say to the Senator that I wish to be fair. I think there was an estimate made by the Agricultural Department during the month of December that the production of wheat in the United States for the year 1920 was nearly 790,000,000 bushels. They found that there was a little more than the first estimate of 750,000,000 bushels; to be accurate, that the crop produced in the United States in 1920 amounted to 789,800,000 bushels, I believe. If we have the same carry over—and it has been stated by the very best of authority that it is exceedingly dangerous for us to have a carry over of less than from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 bushels; and it is practically impossible, I will say to the Senator, for us to sell any closer than that—

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, no, Mr. President, it is not impossible for us to sell it all, but then we would deprive ourselves if we did so.

Mr. GRONNA. I am speaking of the ordinary course of business. With a crop of 790,000,000 bushels we could not possibly export to exceed 100,000,000 bushels, because the remainder would be required for bread.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator ought to qualify that statement. One hundred million bushels is too low; but we could not export 200,000,000 bushels without any importations into this country without, to some extent, reducing the necessary supply for the people of this country. That is what I say we have been doing; I say the 25,000,000 bushels of wheat which have been brought over here constitute a part of that 200,000,000 bushels which we have sent abroad; and when that 25,000,000 bushels are deducted it is plain that the withdrawals from the domestic crop for the export trade were only 175,000,000 bushels.

Mr. GRONNA. I understand that we have imported wheat not only from Canada, but we have imported wheat from Argentina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, Mr. President, we have imported practically none from Argentina this year.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say that I am quite sure that it can be shown that more than 25,000,000 bushels of wheat have been imported into this country from Canada, not for our use, but, as the term is used, "milled in transit" and exported from this country.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, Mr. President, and if, instead of 25,000,000 bushels there had been imported 50,000,000 bushels, in view of the conditions, the shortness of our crop and our large exports, that would not have affected the market one particle, because it would not have left more than enough, if enough, to supply the domestic demand.

But how can those comparatively small importations under any circumstances affect the price? If the contention of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is correct—in the argument—that the 25,000,000 import bushels added to our 750,000,000 bushels production is responsible for the slump which has taken place, suppose we had made this year, instead of a short crop, a big crop, we would have had a bigger slump, would we not?

Upon the argument of the Senator from North Dakota, if this year under present conditions the State of Kansas had made a better crop than it did, if it had produced 25,000,000 more bushels of wheat than it did produce, then that would have brought about a slump, because it can not make any difference in the effect upon this situation from a tariff standpoint whether the 25,000,000 bushels added to the domestic supply came from abroad or came as the result of an increased crop produced in any part of our own country. In other words, if the addition of 25,000,000 bushels of wheat to our domestic stock from Canada has caused a slump in the price of wheat in this country, would not an increase in production in North Dakota of 25,000,000 or 50,000,000 bushels more than was actually produced cause a greater slump in the price of wheat in this country? Therefore, if this year we had made as much as we did in the crop year preceding, amounting to something over 900,000,000 bushels, to-day, according to that contention, the price of wheat would have been at bottom instead of selling for the price which it is now bringing.

But, Mr. President, how about corn? We made last year over 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn in this country. Does anybody contend that the importations of corn into this country have affected the corn market? And yet the fact is indisputable that the slump in the price of corn in this country has been very much greater than the slump in the price of wheat. Last year we were buying corn at this season of the year for from about \$9 to \$11 a barrel, I think. To-day corn is selling even in the retail markets at about \$4.50. There have been no importations of corn that amount to anything. A few years ago we began buying a few million bushels from Argentina, but not in competition with the corn of this country, because the Argentine corn imported was not fit for human food, and I think but to a little extent for animal feed. It was used, and imported to be used, in the manufacture of starches; but even that has been much reduced. No country in the world is sending us corn in any considerable amount, yet this bill proposes to put a duty upon imports of corn; and notwithstanding that there are practically no imports of corn, that there is nothing in the condition of our international trade in corn that affects its value, corn has slumped in value, I should say, 83½ per cent more than wheat. Under those circumstances, the slump must be due to something besides the tariff.

The same thing is true with regard to tobacco. In my section of the country, and most of the South outside of Florida, we do not import one pound of tobacco that is sold or can be sold in competition with the tobacco products of that great section of the country, or the importation of which into this country could possibly affect the market price of tobacco grown in that section of the country. Not a dollar's worth of such tobacco has been imported or could be imported, though there was no tariff, because it is not produced to any great extent in other parts of the earth; and yet, Mr. President, with no importations into this country of that product, the price of this tobacco has fallen from an average of 54 cents a pound to an average of less than 20 cents a pound.

How are we going to account for that slump? If the slump in wheat is due to this 25,000,000 of importations, what has caused the slump in corn and in tobacco, equally staple agricultural products, the slump in which has been much greater than in wheat? Is it not more reasonable, do not all the circumstances point unmistakably to the fact, that this slump is not due to these importations and has not its genesis

in them; that the small imports of these products do not affect the price at all; and therefore that tariff barriers will do no good? What good will a tariff barrier on corn in this country do to the corn producer when practically none is now brought in, none is likely to be brought in, and if brought in could not be imported in sufficient quantities to affect materially the price of a 3,000,000,000-bushel crop?

Why should we wish to put a tariff on corn? What good can it do? However high you make it, you can not make it so high that it will be a more effective embargo than that which now exists. You know it. Every Republican Senator over there has sufficient intelligence to know that; and yet we see here an effort to mislead the distressed, the grievously afflicted corn farmers of this country into the belief that the party in power is diligently at work preparing a measure that will increase the price of corn by putting a duty of 15 cents a bushel on corn imported into this country!

The same argument applies to cotton, but I have no disposition to follow that line of argument to its logical conclusion.

But the Senator says that the bulk of these imports of wheat have come in during the last three months, since the decline in wheat began, and in that way he seeks to bring it into relation with the decline. I have here the Tariff Commission's report upon that. This report is just out. It is brought up to the present time. It says:

Canadian wheat did not come on the market until about September 1, but the price decline had set in some months previously; from a high point of \$3.15 per bushel on June 1, the price declined to \$2.65 on August 20.

A decline of 50 cents a bushel in the price of wheat before these extravagant importations began that the Senator speaks about. As a matter of fact, the importations up to that time had been absolutely negligible. The importations during the three months to which the Senator alludes were not very heavy. Compared with the exports during those three months, they were exceedingly light.

The imports during this period—September, October, and November last—were 9,000,000 bushels a month for the last two months, and very much less than that for the preceding month. During that period the exports very greatly exceeded the imports; but, Mr. President, taking the entire imports for these three months and comparing them with those for the same three months of last year, we find that the total increase in imports was only 20,000,000 bushels of wheat, and that the total imports were 21,000,000 bushels of wheat. The increase in exports during that period was 46,000,000 bushels of wheat as against 20,000,000 bushels, and the total exports during that three months were 92,000,000 bushels as against only 21,000,000 bushels of imports.

In view of the fact that during these three months of the year, when four-fifths of the wheat which we expect to get from Canada, came in, the exports exceeded the imports to the extent of 71,000,000 bushels, is it not ridiculous to say that those imports produced a depreciation in the price of wheat in this country?

But that is not the main argument on which the Senator from North Dakota placed his reliance. The basis of the Senator's argument was that these imports from Canada brought upon the markets of this country a lower-priced product than that which we produce here.

Mr. President, there have been but few times when the price of wheat in Canada has not equaled the price of wheat in this country. There has been, on account of similarity in climatic conditions and population and labor in those sections, but little difference in the cost of production of wheat in Canada and in the United States. This is not a case, and can not be made a case, of an influx of cheap products into this country, inundating the American market, and destroying the value of the domestic product. There is no element of that character in this case. During the three-months period, when the Senator from North Dakota said that this wheat was coming here in mighty volume, but which we find upon examination meant only about 9,000,000 bushels a month, as against from twenty to twenty-five million bushels per month exported, I am prepared to show by official figures that during that very period, those very identical months, when he contended that these relatively cheaper products were being brought in here, Canada depressing the price of the domestic product, wheat was selling in the Canadian market at about the same figure that it was selling here.

But the Senator says that does not take into account the difference in exchange, which is very much in favor of the Canadian price. The figures which I propose to present to the Senate do take into account the difference in exchange between the two countries. Eliminating that, during those two or three months wheat in Canada was very considerably higher than wheat in this country; but after you apply that depreciation and convert the Canadian price into American dollars, the price was

practically the same. I have the statistics here, but for the purposes of this demonstration I shall take the figures given by the Tariff Commission for the very purpose of showing that there was no difference. They are found in Table 5.

It is preceded by this statement:

It is often assumed that American purchasers get the full advantage of the exchange rates when the American dollar is at a premium. This by no means follows, however, in every case. From Table 5, appended below, it is seen that the Winnipeg price of wheat converted into American money is almost the same as that for similar wheat in Minneapolis.

Now let us turn to that table, Mr. President, and I wish to ask that this table be inserted as an appendix to my remarks. [See appendix.] I shall not undertake to read these figures, but you may take each one of these months. It begins with September, the month when the Senator said this flood of importations began. It takes in October, the month in which he said this movement gained great impetus. You may take November, the month in which he said it reached its flood, and you may compare, and Senators will see that in the prices of wheat in Winnipeg on the identical days in September, in October, and in November, after those prices were converted into United States currency at the prevailing rate of exchange, there was practically no difference—some days the Canadian product was a little bit higher than the American, and some days the American product was a little bit higher than the Canadian; but the variation was only a cent or two per bushel.

Mr. President, I had intended further to elaborate this argument. I undertake to say that anybody who is familiar with the facts relating to the different commodities in this bill can take this bill and show that, with the exception possibly of sugar and possibly of a certain grade of cotton and perhaps certain meat products, there is no practical relation between the price of these products in this country and the extent or amount of importations of like foreign products; that whatever disaster has come to the producers of these several products by a decline in the prices below the cost of production, must be attributed to conditions with which most intelligent men are very familiar, which apply here as they apply everywhere throughout the world, that this disastrous condition can not be attributed to imports under any particular rate of tariff.

Mr. President, I desire to put in the RECORD some most illuminating facts presented in the report of the Tariff Commission. The Congress in recent years, proceeding upon an expressed desire coming generally from the people of the country, and acquiesced in on both sides of this Chamber and on both sides of the House of Representatives, passed a law creating a Tariff Commission, upon the theory that the tariff, as far as practicable, should be lifted out of politics, and that if tariff duties were to be levied according to any political theory they ought to at least be levied after a full and thorough investigation and ascertainment of the facts and a report from an expert commission.

We created that commission, and it is generally known that during the period of the war, and until recently since the war, the members of this board of experts have been giving their time to a diligent study and investigation of the facts relating to tariffs upon the various principal items which we treat in our tariff measures. Their investigations have been long; they have been intensive and they have been thorough. We have from them already reports on many subjects, and especially, Mr. President, we have their reports on nearly all the different commodities mentioned in this bill.

Those reports have been available for some time, and yet it is a significant fact that in the Committee on Finance when this important measure was under consideration, when that committee was fixing rates affecting these important products—wheat, meat, flour, wool, woolen goods, cotton goods, and sugar—not a single member of that committee representing the Republican majority referred once to any of the reports or findings of that commission.

In these debates, as far as they have progressed, not one word has been said about the commission's report. We have had a speech from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], lasting nearly an hour and three-quarters, upon the wheat item in the bill, and yet not a line, not a syllable, from the report of the commission. It is not to be assumed that he has not read it. If there had been any grain of comfort in it for the theories and contentions he advances here, he undoubtedly would have exploited the commission's report before the Senate and before the country. Not a line from it did he read, and not a line, Mr. President, will any of the proponents of this bill read from it when they come to consider the other items in this bill, because I undertake to say, after a pretty thorough investigation of these reports upon these various items, that the duties which it is sought to impose by this bill find emphatic condemnation therein, and those reports show

the utter lack of necessity for these proposed duties, the destructive effect of them, and expose the fraud and pretense which lie behind, which permeate, and which inspire this vicious and pernicious proposition of tariff legislation.

Speaking about wheat, I will not read the statement as to exports of wheat, which I read a little while ago. The statement was that our exportable surplus of wheat for the crop year 1920, the fiscal year 1920-21, was estimated to be two hundred to two hundred and twenty-five million bushels, and that up to December 23 there had already been exported from this country 203,000,000 bushels, or practically all of it. Then follows the statement that—

If during the remaining six months of the crop year, when normally about 40 per cent of the export movement occurs, the shipments continue at a fraction of this rate, it is apparent that the United States must replace the exports by foreign wheat. And this is precisely what appears to have been already in progress. This serves to free for export approximately equivalent quantities of domestic grain and flour, for the most part of different classes or from sections other than those which absorb the imports.

That is a recognition of the fundamental fact, Mr. President, that under conditions of that sort we can absorb imports greater than these, indeed several times as great as the actual importations from Canada, without disturbing domestic prices.

This free movement of wheat between the United States and Canada, making the North American crop a common source of supply, has certain demonstrable advantages.

Mr. President, after discussing the advantages and disadvantages of imports from Canada, followed by exports from this country, and balancing the one against the other, the commission states its conclusions. I am reading these excerpts, Mr. President, because I want to get them into the RECORD. These reports were made for the majority party as well as for the minority party. They represent the findings of facts and the conclusions of a bi-partisan board. Senators on the other side will not read these reports, because the reports are against them and their contentions—I think, make their contentions ridiculous; at least, the reports take out from under them all the props by which they are seeking to support themselves. Therefore, proponents of the bill will not read them, and if we are going to get them into the RECORD, we who oppose the bill will have to read them. They are too voluminous to put in as a whole, and therefore I am reading the pertinent excerpts.

The report proceeds:

The causes of the recent decline in wheat prices have been the subject of an extensive investigation by the Federal Trade Commission and the United States Department of Agriculture, acting under directions of the President.

Again I say it is significant that in all the arguments we have had about wheat and in all the arguments we had in the committee about the rates generally no Republican presented the reports of these investigations. The Senator who has championed the cause of the proposed duty on wheat, although there was a report of two great agencies of the Government, in addition to the report by the Tariff Commission, has not presented a word or a line from any of these reports—the report of the Tariff Commission after a thorough investigation, the report of the Federal Trade Commission after a thorough investigation, or the report of the Department of Agriculture after a thorough investigation. Not a line from any of those reports has been submitted to support the bill. The proponents of the bill will not find anything in these reports to support their contention, because it can not be supported by the facts.

The report proceeds:

In the published summary of the report of the Federal Trade Commission seven causes are given for this decline: (1) Conditions of world supply; (2) concentrated governmental buying by European powers; (3) imports from Canada; (4) record-breaking harvests of corn and oats; (5) a decided falling off in the domestic demand for flour during the latter part of 1920; (6) the general price deflation; (7) credit conditions.

Now, taking cognizance of the suggestion that the imports from Canada were considered in this connection, the Tariff Commission addresses itself to the question of the effect of the imports upon the price of wheat, and here is what they say:

It is impossible precisely to determine how important an influence Canadian imports have exerted on the price of wheat in the American market in recent months; but some points in this connection may be indicated.

Canadian wheat did not come on the market until about September 1, but the price decline had set in some months previously (see Table 5): from a high point of about \$3.15 per bushel on June 1, the price declined to \$2.65 on August 20.

That was at a time when the Senator from North Dakota says the imports were absolutely negligible and a month before the Senator says that the influx, of which he complains, set in.

The report proceeds:

It is possible that the prospect of an exceptionally large harvest in Canada may have been a contributing factor in this decline, but it should be noted that in the Pacific States, whose wheat enters into a somewhat distinct trade, prices also declined, although Canadian competition is not an important factor in Pacific markets.

It can not enter them because of the excessive cost of transportation to those markets.

Another point that should be considered is the fact that in each of the fiscal years 1917 and 1918 there were imported around 25,000,000 bushels of wheat, almost entirely from Canada. It is true that these purchases were made by the United States Grain Corporation, with the understanding that equivalent quantities of wheat or flour should be exported. But these imports were made to meet sectional shortages, either of all kinds or of different classes of wheat; and, being made at lower price levels than existed in the United States, might have been due to commercial influences had they been free to operate. During these years, however, the imports were without apparent effect because of conditions of international demand.

Conditions which are just as influential and determining in the present situation as in that.

The imports, therefore, were somewhat of the same character as those which took place in 1920.

In addition to these factors, there are others connected with the effect on prices of Canadian imports which are brought out in the tables submitted below.

Now this is important, Mr. President:

From the tables of imports and exports of wheat and from commercial estimates for the early part of December, it appears that the American exports have been roughly 200,000,000 bushels since July 1, 1920, whereas the imports, chiefly from Canada, have been about 25,000,000 in the same period. In normal times a preponderance of exports over imports as great as that indicated here means that American prices follow the international market for wheat. Indeed, this is almost axiomatic if trade is unobstructed. Liverpool is usually the center of the world market and when a given country is on an exporting basis the price of wheat there is usually lower than that of Liverpool by the amount of transportation and other handling charges between the two markets.

Why, Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota yesterday contended laboriously and vigorously that the price of wheat in this country was not regulated by the price of wheat in Liverpool, which is the world market, which fixes the world price; and yet if we will think just a moment about the situation, we shall conclude it must inevitably be so regulated. So where a nation is upon a large export basis, as we are with reference to cotton and wheat, if the price in Liverpool were not a little bit better than the price here, if the dealer could not get the same or a better price for his product in Liverpool than he could get in the markets of his own country, there would not be any inducement to export.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a moment, if the Senator please. I will be through in a moment. That is so fundamentally true that we had here for years, based upon that proposition, a great political party composed of some of the most intelligent people in the country, largely represented by the agricultural interests of the country—and say what you will about the farmers, I have found them to be among the best informed citizens in the country. The agricultural class is, as a rule, better informed upon these matters than the average city dwellers. The farmers have become readers. They have been readers for years. They study political questions, they study tariff questions, and they especially study with great scrutiny and persistence and thoroughness questions connected with the market prices of their products and the fixation of those prices. Yet the great party to which I referred maintained and demonstrated that the prices of our agricultural products, especially those of which we export large quantities, like cotton and wheat, were fixed in the markets of the world, and that it was the Liverpool price that determined it. That is an axiomatic rule that has been accepted in this country and throughout the world.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator pardon an inquiry in that connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I would like to have the Senator explain how it was that in one year, I think either 1909 or 1910, Minneapolis, Duluth, and Liverpool for months quoted prices that would not range more than 3 to 4 cents in difference between them, and at the same time the transportation would amount to about 16 cents per bushel? If Liverpool always governs the price, why was it that during one of those years the prices were the same in Minneapolis as in Liverpool?

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, Mr. President, I do not know what the prices were in those years, but I am quite sure if there was any marked difference between the Liverpool price and the price in this country and the price throughout the world, that it can be explained by some exceptional condition.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will explain the exceptional conditions when I have the opportunity.

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not stop in the middle of a speech to make an investigation as to what were the conditions surrounding the market for wheat in 1910. I am dealing with the price and the market for wheat in the year 1920.

After saying that Liverpool is the market in which world prices are fixed, the report of the Tariff Commission goes on to state:

At the present time, however, this rule is not subject to statistical proof because the European prices are largely artificially fixed. No open-market quotations for Liverpool are available; only the British prices fixed by the Royal Commission on Supplies are published, and for present purposes these are not significant. A further disturbing factor is illustrated in Table 6, in which it is shown that there are heavy exports directly to continental Europe rather than through the usual clearing markets of Liverpool and London.

In view of these disturbing factors—arbitrary prices abroad and heavy direct shipments to the Continent—care should be exercised in assuming that the American market is now following the European purchase price.

They tell about some of the conditions growing out of the concentrated governmental buying of Great Britain and the fixation of prices by that country on wheat, and then the report proceeds:

Aside from the question of price levels, however, it may be said with some certainty that inasmuch as the United States is on an exporting basis, any wheat that is imported from Canada (aside from the question of special cases to meet special needs) releases an equal amount of American wheat for export. This being true, it is not a matter of great importance whether the Canadian wheat reaches Europe directly or indirectly through the United States either in the form of flour or by releasing similar American wheat. Indeed, if we may assume that the European demand is controlling our market, as it does in normal times when we are on an exporting basis, there is a possibility that if the Canadian wheat had been thrown on the English market before the close of lake navigation, instead of filtering slowly through the United States, the world price level, and therefore our own market, would have been depressed more than it was in the fall of 1920.

There we have the broad statement, Mr. President, that we are upon an exporting basis; that the price is fixed in Liverpool; that in these circumstances it makes no difference whether 25,000,000 bushels of wheat came to the United States and were reexported in the form of wheat or flour or were sent directly to Great Britain, so far as the effect upon us is concerned, except that but for this buffer of its coming through the United States instead of going directly to Europe the price of wheat would have been depressed more than it was in the fall of 1920. Then the report adds:

From this point of view it seems fortunate for American producers—

Listen to that, Mr. President and Senators—

From this point of view it seems fortunate for American producers that there was a buffer between the great Canadian surplus and the Liverpool market.

A further important point is the exchange situation between the United States and Canada. Recently Canadian exchange has been at a discount of 8 to 15 per cent, and this has disturbed the general trade between the two countries.

It is often assumed that American purchasers get the full advantage of the exchange rates when the American dollar is at a premium. This by no means follows, however, in every case. (From Table 5.)

That is the table which I have asked be inserted in the RECORD. I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to it, and I hope he will give it a careful reading. It not only confounds but obliterates and annihilates and demolishes the very basic foundation upon which he lays his case. The table reads as follows:

TABLE 5.—Cash prices per bushel of wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg.

Minneapolis prices are for No. 1 northern spring wheat, compiled from the Northwestern Miller (median of high and low).

Winnipeg prices are for Manitoba No. 1 northern wheat, at Port Arthur, compiled from the Northwestern Miller.

Winnipeg prices are converted into United States currency at the rate of exchange prevailing on the date of the quotation.

Date, 1920.	Minneapolis No. 1, northern spring.	Winnipeg.	
		Mani- toba No. 1 (per of ex- change).	Northern (current ex- change).
May 1.....	\$3.07		
May 15.....	3.15		
June 4.....	3.12		
June 18.....	3.00		
July 3.....	2.85		
July 17.....	2.95		
Aug. 5.....	2.62		
Aug. 20.....	2.65		
Aug. 25.....	2.49	\$2.70	\$2.39
Aug. 26.....	2.49	2.71	
Aug. 27.....	2.45	2.79	2.43
Aug. 28.....	2.47		
Aug. 30.....	2.48	2.76	2.45
Aug. 31.....	2.49	2.77	2.47
Sept. 1.....	2.50	2.81	2.52
Sept. 2.....	2.50	2.82	2.53
Sept. 3.....	2.52	2.76	
Sept. 4.....	2.50	2.77	
Sept. 6.....			

TABLE 5.—Cash prices per bushel of wheat, etc.—Continued.

Date, 1921.	Minneapolis No. 1, Northern Spring.	Winnipeg.	
		Manitoba No. 1 (par of exchange).	Northern (current exchange).
Sept. 7.	\$2.51	\$2.77
Sept. 8.	2.61	2.82	2.55
Sept. 9.	2.64	2.80	2.54
Sept. 10.	2.62	2.81	2.54
Sept. 11.	2.62	2.85	2.57
Sept. 12.	2.66	2.83	2.55
Sept. 13.	2.57	2.80	2.52
Sept. 14.	2.57	2.82
Sept. 15.	2.54	2.78
Sept. 16.	2.58	2.81	2.53
Sept. 17.	2.56	2.79	2.52
Sept. 18.	2.56	2.78	2.50
Sept. 19.	2.45	2.68	2.41
Sept. 20.	2.49	2.73	2.46
Sept. 21.	2.49	2.70	2.43
Sept. 22.	2.38	2.64	2.38
Sept. 23.	2.31	2.54	2.30
Sept. 24.	2.33	2.55	2.30
Sept. 25.	2.39	2.57
Sept. 26.	2.39	2.58
Sept. 27.	2.30	2.48	2.24
Sept. 28.	2.23	2.42	2.19
Oct. 1.	2.24	2.38	2.14
Oct. 2.	2.04	2.24	2.03
Oct. 3.	2.00	2.17	1.97
Oct. 4.	2.08	2.21
Oct. 5.	2.10	2.22	2.04
Oct. 6.	2.05	2.20	2.02
Oct. 7.	2.08	2.26	2.08
Oct. 8.	2.17	2.35	2.15
Oct. 9.	2.16	2.34
Oct. 10.	2.22	2.38	2.15
Oct. 11.	2.18	2.35	2.12
Oct. 12.	2.27	2.45	2.21
Oct. 13.	2.27
Oct. 14.	2.23
Oct. 15.	2.20
Oct. 16.	2.13	2.31	2.14
Oct. 17.	2.11	2.35	2.14
Oct. 18.	2.05	2.29	2.07
Oct. 19.	2.09	2.33	2.11
Oct. 20.	2.07
Oct. 21.	2.05	2.27	2.05
Oct. 22.	2.12	2.35	2.12
Oct. 23.	2.09	2.31
Oct. 24.	2.11	2.32	2.10
Oct. 25.	2.11	2.33	2.11
Oct. 26.	2.11	2.32	2.10
Oct. 27.	2.11	2.31	2.09
Nov. 1.	2.11	2.29
Nov. 2.	2.07	2.27	2.03
Nov. 3.	2.01	2.23
Nov. 4.	1.97	2.21	2.00
Nov. 5.	1.90	2.15	1.94
Nov. 6.	1.83	2.08
Nov. 7.	1.76	2.00
Nov. 8.	1.83	2.12
Nov. 9.	1.77	2.10	1.87
Nov. 10.	1.72	2.11
Nov. 11.	1.75	2.08	1.85
Nov. 12.	1.80	2.09	1.83
Nov. 13.	1.82	2.11	1.88
Nov. 14.	1.77	2.11	1.88
Nov. 15.	1.74	2.06	1.83
Nov. 16.	1.66	2.05	1.83
Nov. 17.	1.58	1.98	1.77
Nov. 18.	1.53	1.95	1.75
Nov. 19.	1.62	1.95	1.75
Nov. 20.	1.54	1.87	1.65
Nov. 21.	1.83
Nov. 22.	1.47	1.79	1.57
Nov. 23.	1.49	1.83	1.61
Nov. 24.	1.51	1.87	1.65
Nov. 25.	1.48	1.78	1.58
Nov. 26.	1.55	1.84	1.62
Dec. 1.	1.64	1.92	1.68
Dec. 2.	1.69	1.97	1.72
Dec. 3.	1.70	2.02	1.77
Dec. 4.	1.80	2.07	1.81
Dec. 5.	1.72	1.89	1.63
Dec. 6.	1.70
Dec. 7.	1.68	1.96	1.69
Dec. 8.	1.59	1.92	1.65
Dec. 9.	1.61	1.92	1.66
Dec. 10.	1.62	1.85	1.60
Dec. 11.	1.66	1.89	1.63
Dec. 12.	1.59	1.88	1.61
Dec. 13.	1.59	1.86	1.59
Dec. 14.	1.65	1.94	1.65
Dec. 15.	1.66	1.91	1.62
Dec. 16.	1.69
Dec. 17.	1.66
Dec. 18.	1.66
Dec. 19.	1.69
Dec. 20.	1.66
Dec. 21.	1.66

From Table 5, it is seen that the Winnipeg price of wheat converted into American money is almost the same as that for similar wheat in Minneapolis.

This identity of prices in the two markets is of importance in connection with the exchange situation. It is obvious that the American purchaser of Canadian wheat can not get it any cheaper than he can buy the same grades of the domestic product; in other words, there is no special inducement for buying Canadian wheat offered by the ex-

change situation. It does not appear that the individual seller has a greater incentive to sell in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg, because as a matter of fact the prices are about the same in the two markets.

If this country were on a net importing basis the prices obviously would be depressed by the imports from Canada, but at a time when heavy exports are going out of the country the relatively small imports probably do not alter the general rule that it is of no great importance whether Canadian wheat reaches the European markets directly or indirectly through the United States.

And yet, Mr. President, in the face of this report of a bipartisan commission, made in response to a law that imposes upon them the duty of impartial and thorough investigation of these questions, and of reporting the facts and their conclusions and inferences to this body and to the other House of Congress—in the face of the statement I have quoted in a report submitted by a commission of that character after that kind of an investigation by these experts, the Senator from North Dakota stands here and says that on account of the lower price of wheat in Canada, the dumping of that wheat upon this market is congesting this market place, and is producing stagnation and a radical decline in prices. That might be a pretty good argument if leveled against a commodity produced in a country where on account of starvation wages or climatic conditions products similar to those of America could be produced for a very much lower price and were habitually offered at a lower price, and were at a particular time being poured in across the border inundating the market and freezing out the domestic producer. Arguments of that kind have been made in the past, but nine times out of ten, Mr. President, they have had but very little foundation in fact. I have had enough connection with tariff witnesses who have come before committees of Congress to know that many of them come armed—not intentionally but unwittingly armed—with a lot of propaganda frequently misstating and falsifying the facts for the purpose of bringing about legislative action to bestow upon certain classes in this country governmental benefactions. However, when the argument comes from the Senator from North Dakota, who lives near the Canadian line, that the producers in this country are being ruined by the influx of cheap Canadian wheat, I say he ought at least to give some attention—and I ask that he do so—to this finding of the Tariff Commission, which, if true, not only destroys his argument in that respect but undermines and removes every prop upon which he bases his contention in behalf of the proposed duty upon wheat.

RECOGNITION OF OREGON GOVERNMENT.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have received a resolution in the nature of a memorial, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which I will read, as follows:

STATE OF ARIZONA, FIFTH STATE LEGISLATURE.

Senate Joint Memorial 1.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Fifth Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represent:

Whereas there has existed for a period of years in the Republic of Mexico a condition of civil strife causing untold misery, destruction of life and property, and an almost complete cessation of civil government; and

Whereas there has arisen in the Republic of Mexico a man, intensely loyal to his country, sympathetic, broad-minded, and humane, a student of conditions in his own country and throughout the world, and with a mission to retrieve the lost powers and fortune of his country—the Hon. Alvaro Obregon; and

Whereas the electorate of the said Republic of Mexico has by an almost unanimous vote selected the said Alvaro Obregon to be its President; and

Whereas the people of the State of Arizona recognize the unquestioned ability, honor, and integrity of the newly elected President of Mexico, Alvaro Obregon, and believe that through him and his able administration of the duties of his office as president of the Republic of Mexico, a new era, one of happiness, prosperity, and freedom, is dawning for our sister republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, That the United States of America be memorialized through congressional act and by its authorized officials, to extend to the Republic of Mexico and to its duly elected president, Alvaro Obregon, full recognition; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial and these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, and to each of our Representatives in Congress, and that each of the said Representatives in Congress be requested and urged to do all in their power toward the securing of such recognition.

Passed the senate January 14, 1921.

H. B. WILLIAMSON,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

ROY N. DAVIDSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house January 18, 1921.

Attest:

P. C. KEEFE,
Speaker of the House.

Approved January 21, 1921.

OSCAR ZAFF,
Chief Clerk of the House.

THOMAS CAMPBELL,
Governor of Arizona.

I also read the following Associated Press dispatch:
[By Associated Press.]

PHOENIX, January 22.

Gov. Campbell signed and returned to the senate this morning senate memorial No. 1, a resolution by the Arizona Legislature urging the President to recognize the Mexican Government. In returning it to the legislature the governor sent a note accompanying it, in which he said: "It is not necessary for me to sign this memorial, but I take pleasure in doing so, because it gives me opportunity to express how heartily in favor of this resolution I am."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The memorial of the Legislature of Arizona presented by the Senator from Arizona will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUSPENSION OF NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to take a few moments to call attention to the resolution which passed the Senate day before yesterday, which I offered, asking the Committee on Naval Affairs to make a report concerning the condition of the Navy and as to the wisdom of suspending the building program of the Navy for the next six months.

Some time ago I offered a resolution which had for its purpose the bringing together of the three great navy-building nations, with a view of securing, if possible, an understanding by which the building programs might be reduced. There seems to be an opinion in some quarters that that matter ought to be delayed for a time, and I am not about to discuss whether or not it should be delayed. I shall discuss that question later; but if it is to be delayed, then it seems to me extremely important that we know something of the condition of our building program and as to whether or not it is along the lines which will make for efficiency in case we should ever be called upon to make use of the Navy.

It is now contended by some of the great naval experts of the world that what is known as the capital ship, or the battleship, will be practically useless in future naval warfare. Of course, I do not assume to pass an opinion on any such question, but it does seem to me that a layman may feel keenly interested in knowing what the ultimate judgment of the experts is to be upon this subject. We are responsible for the expenditure of these vast sums of money, and we should have the best information possible as to whether they are being wisely expended.

We are now engaged in building some 16 capital ships. The present cost of these ships is about \$40,000,000 apiece. If it should transpire that they are inefficient or obsolete for modern warfare, it would be a tremendous blunder to go ahead and complete them; and it was with a view of ascertaining the best thought and the best judgment upon this question that I introduced this resolution. I do not know what information the committee has had before it with reference to this subject. I only know that the information with reference to the subject in this country is very meager. I happen to know that there are men in the Navy who believe that the capital ship will no longer be serviceable in modern naval warfare, but they do not feel exactly free to give that information under present conditions, unless they are called upon to do so.

The English cabinet have taken up this question, and they are dealing with it with their usual foresight and vigilance. Mr. Chamberlain, speaking in the House of Commons a few days ago with reference to cabinet decisions, said that the Government is determined to maintain the Navy at a standard of strength which will adequately secure the safety of the Empire and its maritime communications. They have decided—with the hearty concurrence of the admiralty—that the committee of imperial defense shall "institute at once an exhaustive investigation into the whole question of naval strength as affected by the latest developments of naval warfare."

The Government will therefore present no program to Parliament for capital-ship construction until the results of this inquiry have been considered.

I understand that that is now the settled policy of the English Government—to know thoroughly, and as conclusively as it can be known, what the revelations of the war are with reference to what constitutes an efficient navy. In that country, a country which for 200 years has dominated the sea, it is deemed wise to make haste slowly, not only in the interest of the taxpayers, but in the interest of an efficient navy, and, above all, in the interest of that continued control of the sea so vital to her existence. They have, therefore, deferred all building for six months and set their experts to work and asked for the fullest and freest expressions from all students of the subject. In England they still have freedom of speech in the navy, and many of the best men in their navy contend that the navy as it is now proposed, or has heretofore been proposed, is an obsolete navy.

One of the advocates of a suspension of the building program is Admiral Scott, of the British Navy; and I take the liberty

of reading a paragraph or two from a late communication of his to the public published in the London Times. He says:

During the war the submarine dominated everything and very nearly lost us the war. It was only the Germans' want of forethought that saved us; with 50 more submarines—how little it would have cost them!—they would have now been rulers of the world and we should have been a German colony. It makes one shudder to think that the destiny of a great nation can be decided by one little, very little, mistake. We want forethought now, and must not too lightly scrap Jackie Fisher's idea that air fighting dominates future war. Lord Sydenham thinks Lord Fisher's views may have been entirely mistaken, but he admits that Lord Fisher's visions of the future were almost uncanny in their accuracy. Let us look to the future and prepare for a great development in the submarine, the mine, and the aeroplane; and we must not forget that the submarine did drive the battleship from the ocean or to the bottom of it.

Our battleships and the German battleships were locked up for most of the war. The German Admiral von Scheer only saw the smoke of Jellicoe's fleet once; that was enough for him; he ran away as quickly as he could, without doing any appreciable harm to Lord Jellicoe's ships. I am told that the torpedo did not do much during the war. That is rather unfair on the gallant gentlemen who commanded our submarines; they were given dud torpedoes to fire, and the Germans must have had some dud commanders in their submarines or they would have gone into Scapa and sunk our fleet in 1914. We must not only think of what the torpedo did, but of what in more skillful German hands it ought to have done.

We must not forget that tiny little mistake the Germans made in their building program of 1911-12, for this mistake gave freedom to civilization, and if some one comes along with ideas a little off the beaten track Lord Sydenham must not regard them as a fantastic dream, nor think that the some one has not grasped the logical result of his theory, or that the some one is suffering from midsummer madness.

Rear Admiral Hall, in the London Times of December 30, 1920, said:

There has been nothing yet written to shake my confidence in the necessity for now providing for naval defense by thoroughly efficient air, submarine, and mining services. All these are mobile and economical. They are available for protection of home and overseas bases and for the defense of trade. They can protect themselves and the place they work from, and do not run the risk of having to wait in harbors (which must in any case be defended by the three services I have named) for a battle which may never come.

Perhaps the strongest reason of all, which I have kept to the last, is that battleships can not take the offensive; they hand over the initiative to the enemy. They did so in the last war, and all the time we went about feeling as though we were being kicked, with all the will and means, but no power to kick back. We talked of digging out rats, but battleships were of no use for it, and they never will be; it is air mastery alone that can give us the power of a vigorous offensive.

Admiral Grant, retired, in the London Times of December 29, 1920, said:

What would have been the result of the war had the Germans in the years preceding it built submarines rather than battleships? It appears to be admitted that we should in that case have lost the war by starvation (food and supplies generally) had we not met such action by ourselves ceasing capital-ship construction and devoting our attention to counter-measures. In other words, our grand fleet of capital ships would not have saved us, and Germany would have won without them. The whole question is one of very great difficulty, and it seems that embarkation at the present moment on a program of huge and costly capital ships is to be deprecated for the following reasons:

1. That it is at least doubtful if money spent on capital ships at the present time is wisely spent.

And he gives other reasons, which I may, in the interest of time, omit for the present.

I read from an editorial in the New York Tribune of recent date, although I have not the exact date. This editorial says:

Admiral von Scheer, who commanded at Jutland, has recently expressed the following opinions:

1. Surface ships are tremendously expensive, and yet they are very vulnerable.

2. Hitherto only a few nations could afford these big ships, and so they ruled the sea. But the submarine has knocked all this into a cocked hat, and "fear of the British fleet as a fighting weapon has gone."

3. That a great surface fleet can no longer protect a coast or overseas commerce.

4. That submarines can best defend or attack a coast and can best protect or destroy commerce.

5. In short, an adequate submarine navy will enable a comparatively weak nation to pursue an overseas policy, "without worrying about a surface fleet."

The editorial further says:

Lord Rothermere, formerly director of England's air force, makes the following assertions in an article entitled "The folly of the big battleship":

1. Referring to the United States and Japan: "They are obviously building against each other and not against us." "Great Britain can not afford to spend money on naval construction at present."

2. "If the United States and Japan persist in pursuing antiquated forms of warfare, that is no proof that capital ships will survive."

3. "No nation henceforth will enjoy naval supremacy. It is a nasty pill, but we must swallow it."

I quote from another article by Admiral Scott, which was published in the London Times. I quote only a few paragraphs from it. He said:

"What is the use of a battleship?" All I want to know is what rôle our battleship is going to play if we are at war with a near enemy, say, France; a medium-distance enemy, say, in the Mediterranean; or a far-distant enemy in the East.

These three and many other phases of war must have been discussed and thoroughly thrashed out before our admiralty decided to build a new fleet of battleships costing the country £9,000,000 each. Our

admiralty and foreign admiralities must know "what is the use of a battleship." The public of the United States and Japan must know the use of battleships or they would not have subscribed the money to build them. The British public have not been told why (when we are so hard up) our already taxation to the limit should be increased by spending millions on battleships, which a midshipman tells me are "no damned good."

Then, referring to the committee on imperial defense, he said:

This committee is, I am told, composed chiefly of lawyers. These gentlemen may know all about the effect of the shape of the earth on a gyroscopically controlled compass of a battleship, the blow-down valves of a submarine, and all the scientific and technical sides of the naval officer's profession. If they are well-versed in all these subjects, they can with reliability answer the midshipman, and at the same time tell the country "what the use of a battleship is."

Then, speaking to the editor of the London Times, he continues:

Now, sir, you must admit that it is most important that the public, who will be called upon to provide the money for building battleships, should, before they part with their money, know of what service to the country these vessels are going to be.

You must admit that in the war we were nearly forced to submission by starvation.

You must admit that the German battleships played no part in reducing us to a state of starvation.

You must admit that if our battleship superiority had been double what it was they could not have protected us from starvation.

You must admit that the dominant arm of the war was the submarine. You must admit that our belief before the war that the submarine was only a toy resulted in our coming to the brink of losing the war. You must admit that this erroneous idea before the war resulted in our blunder of building the wrong weapons to combat the submarine.

Further on he says:

I do not understand why my friend Admiral Waymouth did not add that she must be able to fly and dive.

This pattern of vessel is at present not on the market. When they are every country will want a lot of them, and I shall be early in admitting that this battleship is the backbone of a navy.

Admiral Waymouth's idea of war is splendid. We must carry the war into the enemy's country, destroy his fleet, his coaling stations, docks, fortifications, and his important coast towns. Our battleships did all these things 100 years ago, but they did not do any of them during the last war. On the contrary, our battleships, if there were any submarines about, kept well away from the enemy's country, from his coaling stations, his docks, his fortifications, and his important coast towns.

What is the use of a battleship?

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. The writer of the article to which the Senator has just referred commented—I do not know whether in a complimentary spirit or otherwise—upon lawyers. May it not be said that most lawyers, whether in Great Britain or the United States, are for peace and for the upholding of law and order, and that those who have been the promoters in the main of large battleships and munitions of war and armaments have been either the manufacturers of munitions or naval and army officers? As a rule you will find the naval officer and the army officer ardent advocates of big armies and big navies.

Mr. BORAH. I think what Admiral Scott had in mind was that in all probability a committee of lawyers would not know very much about what constitutes a fighting navy. I do not think he was reflecting upon the general morale or the patriotism of the profession, but rather upon a possible lack of knowledge in regard to that particular matter.

I would like to say here, too, Mr. President, that if there is any way under our bureaucratic system of government to release the members of the Navy to an expression of their real views on this subject I should like to have it done. I know there are men high in the service of this country who have long been connected with the American Navy who feel that the expenditure of money upon these battleships is a waste of money, and if we could have the same freedom of discussion that is taking place in England upon this subject I think we would be able to arrive, possibly, at a sound conclusion, and I doubt if we shall ever arrive at a sound conclusion in any other way. As a layman I might have my view about it, but we must have the unbiased and uncontrolled view of those who have made a life study of it. They must be permitted to say what they think without being brought to task for doing it.

I read from an article in the New York Tribune, and I happen to know the party who wrote this article. I feel perfectly safe in asking the Senate to give particular attention to it, and if we have an investigation the party will be perfectly willing to state his views in a more extended way. He said:

We are face to face with a knotty problem: What constitutes an up-to-date fighting navy—a navy with the weapons and organization best designed to meet the conditions of the present and the near future in naval warfare?

1. The submarine. In a lecture at the Army General Staff College more than a year ago Capt. Hart, United States Navy, estimated that 10,000 officers and men constituted the maximum force employed by the Germans in their submarine campaign. And yet this small force came within an ace of starving England and winning the war. Despite the

Grand Fleet and allied navies, despite the millions of land forces on all fronts, the submarine dominated the situation at the most critical stage of the war. Can this fact be ignored?

Again:

Reviewing briefly, we see that the dreadnaught fleet is terribly menaced. It must be protected at all times—at anchor or at sea—by destroyers, submarines, mine layers, and a strong air force. It can not exist, still less can it attack, without auxiliary flotillas above and below.

There are distinguished authorities who declare that the dreadnaught is useless to-day. In September, 1919, Admiral Lord Fisher wrote: "Air fighting dominates future war, both by land and sea. It is not my business to discuss the land, but by sea the only way to avoid the war is to get under the water. So you are driven to the internal combustion engine and oil. That's why I keep on emphasizing that the whole Navy has to be scrapped." Admiral Sir Percy Scott agrees with Lord Fisher. He declares that the dreadnaught must hide in hermetically sealed harbors to avoid submarines, and that the harbors must be roofed over as a protection from bombing planes.

Between these two extremes we must take our stand. For the United States a midposition is wisest for the present. We should not scrap our dreadnaughts nor our surface fleet, but we must realize the weakness and limitations of such craft. Pending the development of menacing weapons, and in view of the fact that our surface fleet is strong in dreadnaughts to-day, it would seem that we should suspend the building of ships that may be doomed in the near future and supply the Navy with the submarine and air forces which are necessary to the effective protection and offensive use of our surface ships.

The need of immediate and intelligent action is imperative. It has been shown that there is not one up-to-date long-range submarine in our Navy to-day.

Thus, on the upper and lower planes of a modern fighting Navy, the United States is unprepared for war. With these facts staring us in the face, is it not manifest that the money available should be expended to supply submarine and air forces before we build any more capital ships? It is simply a question of placing the money where it will do the most good. If our future enemy advances on the upper and lower planes, our surface fleet, in its present condition, would be seriously menaced. It is a national emergency that now confronts us.

Mr. President, as I understand, we have initiated the building of some 16 battleships, which cost about \$40,000,000 apiece now. That means an expenditure of \$640,000,000. The idea which I had in mind when I introduced the resolution was that we should know, as definitely as it can be known before we continue this program, that it will bring us an efficient navy. We certainly do not desire to build to the extent of \$640,000,000 and then find ourselves in 1925 with an obsolete navy. I am informed that the Agricultural appropriation bill carries altogether \$33,000,000. That is \$7,000,000 less than one of these possibly obsolete battleships costs. It is bad enough to have to spend this money at all, but it is indefensible to spend it unless we know it gives us the most modern of navies.

I am not one of those who believe in a weak navy or a small navy, unless our security can be arranged through understandings or agreements which make us equally safe. I presume that everyone, however, whether he is for a large navy or small navy, would like to know whether the navy is to comply with those standards, which the best investigation and thought declare to be an efficient navy.

I do not desire at this time to go further than simply to call attention to this condition of affairs in order to justify the introduction of the resolution. If there is not to be a report upon such information as we now have, then, of course, it ought to be followed by a resolution which would provide for a thorough investigation. If the report coming back from the Committee on Naval Affairs should disclose that we are without the information which we ought to have, and that a thorough investigation of the subject should be had, I shall be glad to offer the resolution which will provide it.

There is another proposition connected with the suspension of the building program, and that is the question that possibly in the near future we may arrive at some understanding with Great Britain and Japan with reference to the building program of the future. Whether that will result in anything substantial or not, if the other reason for delaying is a sufficient reason, it is very fortunate that the two propositions come together at this time. I have thought that it was not inappropriate, not having heard from other sources, to introduce the resolution and call for the information. I want, above all things, to see an agreement with Japan and England which will enable us to cut down our burdensome expenses. If that can not be had, then I want to see the most efficient navy possible for the money which we put into it. Both these propositions can be carried along together, and both should have prompt attention and prompt action.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Has the Senator any information which would lead him to know or believe that the Navy officials have made or are making any investigation as to the

efficiency of our present type of ship as compared with the submarine?

Mr. BORAH. I have no information except that I saw in yesterday's paper a statement to the effect that the Secretary of the Navy had initiated an investigation or called upon the board for information in regard to it. If there is any information, or if there has been any investigation, I have not been informed.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I presume the present naval program is the one that was outlined and instituted quite a good many years ago?

Mr. BORAH. Five years ago.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Five years ago, and it is in pursuance of that program that we have provided for the building of ships. All the information which the Senator has given the Senate has grown out of the last five years, and particularly the last three years, when the German submarine manifested its efficiency in time of war. I was wondering if the Senator was informed as to whether our naval officials have taken sufficient cognizance of that fact to ascertain whether it would be advisable for us to carry out the program of five years ago or to supplement it with such recommendations as the submarine has manifested may be necessary?

Mr. BORAH. I am not informed as to what the Navy or the Secretary of the Navy have done in regard to the matter. My remarks should not be construed as a criticism of the Secretary of the Navy for having failed to make investigation, because I do not know what investigation has been made. I only know that the legislative body which must pass upon the appropriations and continue the building program, has no information before it officially, or otherwise really, with reference to the matter. If the Secretary of the Navy has conducted an investigation and has information which justifies the present program, I presume the Committee on Naval Affairs will bring it out in their report. If he has not, I feel sure that it ought to be done before we go any further.

Mr. GERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GERRY. I will state for the information of the Senator from South Carolina, and possibly it may clear his mind on the subject, that the 1916 program was not carried out at that time owing to the war. For example, the building of battleships was laid aside in order to build destroyers, and a great many destroyers were built. A great many of them are now completed, but since that time naturally naval officers have studied the conditions that have arisen out of the war. As soon as the destroyer program was carried out and the emergency for destroyers was over, they laid down these battleships, as I understand it, with the knowledge gained from the experiences of the war.

In other words, it is not simply a carrying out, as I understand it, of a program of five years ago. It is carrying out a modern program, the experience gained from the war being taken advantage of.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; in just a moment.

Mr. GERRY. What I have stated was in answer to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BORAH. I assume—and I think I have information which justifies the assumption—that our Navy has taken advantage of the revelations made by the battle of Jutland, so far as perfecting the battleships is concerned.

Mr. GERRY. And the battle cruiser, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. And the battle cruiser; but the larger question, whether we are going to depend in the future upon surface ships at all, I understand has not been gone into. However, as to that I may be mistaken.

Mr. GERRY. I will state to the Senator that naturally naval officers have been discussing that question in this country and in England, and the extracts he has read show the English are debating it thoroughly.

I will also say to the Senator that I have some views that I shall express in the future on this subject that may perhaps be of some use to him, although I do not think I can concur in the statement in the excerpts which the Senator has read that the German policy of building submarines would give command of the sea to the nation which adopted that policy. However, I understand from the statement of the Senator from Idaho that that is not his own opinion. The fact stands out very clearly that there were no German merchant ships on the sea during the war unless they were raiders, and that the English merchantman was able to feed the English, although with difficulty, on account of the submarine campaign until that was stifled. But the English merchantman still kept the

sea, and the fact is that the nation which had the capital ships, the dreadnaughts, was the nation that was able to maintain that control and the nation that did not have a preponderance of those ships was bottled up.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I am familiar with that argument, because, of course, it is the argument which has been made by the men in England who believe it, but I think there is a very reasonable answer to it. However, I am not going into a long discussion to-day.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows I am in very hearty sympathy with his disarmament suggestion. Could the Senator give us any information as to how many of the capital ships have already been contracted for and begun? As I have understood it, all of them have been contracted for and a number of them have been begun and a great deal of work has been done on many of them. I was wondering what effect it would have if we stopped the work now. What would be the cost to the country?

Mr. BORAH. That is information which I have asked for from the committee, as to the practical result of suspending building operations at this time. I do not know whether it is practical or not. I think it is, but I want full information.

Of course, if we should come to the conclusion that the surface ship is obsolete, there is no need of going ahead, no difference how far the contract is completed. I presume we will likely arrive at some compromise, such as finishing the ships practically completed and suspending with reference to those which may not be very far along. That, however, is merely a suggestion. I do not know what the real program will be. I have not been informed as to what is the attitude of those who direct our affairs here on that question.

I was going to say, however, that there was a statement made by the writer in the New York Tribune that there is not now with the American Navy a single modern, up-to-date submarine. That to me is a very startling proposition. I understand a submarine costs about a million dollars. We can take the cost of two battleships and expend the money for submarines and we would have 40 submarines upon the Atlantic coast and 40 submarines upon the Pacific coast. Just as a layman, not as an expert, but exercising that common sense which is the great reserve power of the American people and without which we would soon pass into mental bankruptcy, it seems to me that I would rather have 40 submarines strung up and down the Pacific coast, so far as any neighbor interfering with our affairs is concerned, than to have 8 or 10 battleships. You could take the money necessary to build four battleships and build a hundred submarines, and, so far as defense of our coasts is concerned, defy the world.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to have an expression from the Senator of his opinion as to the probability of any agreement among the nations of the first order as to disarmament. Of course, it is possible; but I ask the Senator what, in his opinion, is the probability of any such agreement?

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt at all that an agreement could be reached if the people of the respective countries could have their voices heeded. Whether or not the militaristic forces, the armament forces, the armament trust, and the men who represent them both in this country and elsewhere are sufficiently strong to prevent the people from having their way, I do not yet know. They give some indication of activity. It may be that they will control the situation. There is no doubt that the masses of Japan, the same as the masses of this country, desire an understanding by which the two nations shall not enter into a competitive naval building program. It is equally true, in my judgment, in England.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So the Senator is of the opinion that if there was any practical way of getting an expression of the views of the people who constitute those several countries, there is a practical probability, if I may use that term, of disarmament?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I think there is a practical possibility of it. I think there is other good to be had from the effort, even if we do not succeed as fully as we desire. I think we owe it to the people of the country, before we put upon them any greater burden for naval armament, to demonstrate that the men in public places have used their utmost effort, and in good faith, to secure an understanding. We ought not to ask them to carry these burdens until it is demonstrated beyond peradventure that no understanding can be had and that therefore we are compelled to build as a matter of security and safety.

Let me say, too, and particularly to those who are very technical with reference to the proceeding, that if we do not demonstrate to the voters of the country that we have endeavored in good faith to secure a partial disarmament or complete disarmament, and that we have failed, and that there-

fore there is no alternative left except, as a matter of security, to build, they will send a Congress here which will cut the appropriations regardless of whether we have a contract or not.

That is one thing in which I am particularly interested. I believe in an efficient Navy, but we build a Navy not as a toy, not for display, but for security and protection. If we can have the same security and the same protection in another way, we are under the highest obligation to secure it in that way; certainly we are under every obligation to try it, and to try it as speedily as we may.

Of course, there are two ways to defeat disarmament. One is to oppose disarmament and present the arguments against it. There are those who sincerely believe that we can not afford to disarm, even under an agreement, and with them I have no quarrel, although I differ with them. They have their own reasons and they act upon them. There are others who are unwilling to say that they are opposed to disarmament; they are perfectly willing to pay lip service to disarmament; but they conjure up all conceivable methods for delay, which is another way of killing the program.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I perhaps have incurred the disapproval of some Senators because of my persistent opposition to appropriation bills, many of which, in my opinion, have been extravagant and carried items wholly unnecessary, and by my constant appeals to Republican Senators since they have been in power in Congress during the past two years to practice promised economies and reduce the Federal appropriations far below the limits indicated by reported measures. I have opposed since the armistice appropriations made for the War Department, as well as for the Navy, believing that the time had come for retrenchment and reform in these two departments, as well as in other executive departments of the Government. I have insisted that unless Congress reduced appropriations and relieved the people from the burdens of war taxation, the people would manifest their disapproval of our course by sending to both branches of the National Legislature men who would reduce the burdens of taxation.

The address of the Senator from Idaho brings strikingly before us the statesmanship of President Wilson and his great labors to secure the peace of the world and bring about world disarmament. From the peace conference at Paris he brought back to the American people an instrument—the covenant of the League of Nations—which provided, in a feasible and practicable way, for world disarmament. The able Senator from Idaho and others who opposed the treaty with Germany are seeking their realization of some of the vital things for which the league was organized.

One of the primary objects of the league was to reduce, if not abolish, standing armies, and relieve the nations from the heavy burdens which are incurred in the construction of battleships which become obsolete almost within a day. Statesmen and those who have sought the peace of the world have for many years endeavored to devise some working plan that would accomplish these ends. Various plans have been proposed and numerous efforts have been made, but all have proven abortive, and this century records the greatest of all wars—the most deadly, the most catastrophic that has ever afflicted humanity. During and immediately following the war, the afflicted peoples in every part of the world cried out for immunity from such horrors and cataclysms in the future. The League of Nations was to them an anchor of hope. It provided a plan for disarmament, and I assert that the more that plan is examined the more feasible it will appear and the stronger will it commend itself to the judgment of fair and impartial men. If those who supported the treaty were seeking vindication or satisfaction by reason of the position of some of those who opposed the league, it could be found in the present situation. There are many who sought the defeat of the treaty of Versailles who appreciate that the world must be relieved from the burdens of military armaments and stupendous naval programs. Efforts are being made to secure world disarmament, and particular efforts are now being directed to bring about a suspension in the construction of great naval battleships. Senators will also remember that one of the purposes of the league was to revive the economic and industrial conditions of Europe, as well as other nations, and to promote the welfare of the world.

It was realized that our prosperity depended upon the prosperity of Europe, and during the discussion of the league, those who advocated the ratification of the treaty insisted that with our entrance into the league the serious condition in Europe would be materially altered, and altered for the better, and that our foreign commerce would increase and the prosperity of the American people be greatly augmented. Only a few days ago we were impressively advised that our foreign trade was languish-

ing and that unless Europe purchased more of our surplus products business and industrial conditions in the United States would become most serious. It was urged that we must find foreign markets for our products and so urgent was the situation that, in order to enable the purchase of our surplus products, we must aid in furnishing credits to foreign populations. Accordingly, the War Finance Corporation was revived with the expectation, as stated by some of the advocates of that course, that it would furnish credits to the extent of several hundred millions, indeed, several billions, of dollars to European peoples, and that with such credits they would be able to purchase American agricultural and manufactured products as well as American raw material, and thus benefit themselves and add to the prosperity of the American people.

One of the objects of the League of Nations, as I have stated, was to produce conditions in Europe that would enable the people there to obtain credits. This would have enabled them to buy American commodities and products. So, we are daily reminded of the advantages which the league would have given us and of the mistake of failing to take our place alongside our Allies for the purpose of consolidating the fruits of victory and of discharging obligations which the war, notwithstanding its victorious ending, imposed upon the allied nations.

Mr. President, I am in accord with the Senator from Idaho in his efforts to secure a reduction of the burdens which naval armament imposes upon the people. I believe that every effort should be made to reduce the costs of maintaining the Army and the Navy to the lowest possible limit consistent with national safety. Of course, there should be no hysteria in the consideration of this question. It is too important to permit prejudices or passions or mere sentimentality to determine our course. We must remember that we are in a dynamic world—a world filled with hates and jealousies, a world where racial antipathies find expression, and where suspicion and distrust and unrest abound. The history of the past must not be disregarded, nor must there be the view that the millennial era has dawned. But there are strong considerations, in my opinion, that call for a modification of the building program.

At any rate, the situation in the world today, notwithstanding the turmoil and strife, is such as to justify a plea worldwide in character for the reduction of the burdens resting upon the nations for military and naval expenditures. I think this is an auspicious moment to appeal for world support in a program calling for a reduction of armaments. Those who believe in the League of Nations can not do otherwise than favor a plan which seeks to unite the world in a common plan to reduce the military and naval burdens which in the past and even now press so heavily upon the people. While I regret that the practical plan proposed by the league is not being followed by our country, nevertheless I shall join in every reasonable and legitimate movement that seeks to realize the beneficent results contemplated by the disarmament program outlined and provided in the covenant of the League of Nations. However, the resolution of the Senator from Idaho merely calls for an investigation by the Naval Affairs Committee. I approve of the resolution, and as a member of the committee shall be glad to join with my colleagues in making such investigation.

It is obvious that the World War has taught us many lessons, and to continue now the program that was laid down four or five years ago seems to me to be absurd.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] has stated that the vessels, the construction of which was authorized before the World War, will be built, notwithstanding the lessons of the war, but that the form, as I understood his statement, will undergo some modification. In other words, the same number of capital ships will be built as was determined upon some four or five years ago, but there will be some changes and modifications in design and, of course, in construction. If I am in error, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Rhode Island correct me.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Utah is correct. It is contemplated that the same number of capital ships shall be constructed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may make a suggestion, as I understand, all of the capital ships referred to have been contracted for, and some of them have been seven-eighths finished, some of them have been three-fourths finished, and perhaps others have been one-half finished, while still others—I think the last one, as my information goes—has only recently been contracted for. What would the Senator from Utah do as to the ships which are under construction? Would he stop their construction?

Mr. KING. The mere fact that we have entered into contracts for the construction of ships would not deter me from halting the execution of those contracts, even if such action

subjected us to damages, if we do not need the ships or if a better plan of naval defense had been devised. It would be folly to build vessels not required, or the types of which were obsolete, or if the war revealed a cheaper and better method of attack and defense. If the experiences of the war have furnished us sufficient evidence of the unwisdom of carrying out the program agreed upon a number of years ago, then we should halt construction until an exhaustive examination can be made and a plan agreed upon that will meet the needs of the country and accord with the plan which technical naval men may recommend.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with the Senator from Utah and all other Senators who wish to enter upon a plan of disarmament; I agree with the Senator entirely that what armament we have should be the very best; but I am sure the Senator will agree with me that before we get through we shall have to leave the matter to experts in the Navy Department to determine which are the best instruments of naval warfare. They certainly would not authorize the building of ships unless they honestly felt they should be constructed. That is the difficulty, as it seems to me, of our taking action so far as the ships already contracted for are concerned. If there is a way to get around it, I should be very glad, indeed, to find it, for, I repeat, I am in hearty sympathy with the idea of disarming if it is possible to do so, and to the extent that it is possible to do so; of course, having in view, first and above all things, the security of our country.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator, in view of the developments of the war and the information which has been conveyed to us, would he be willing now, upon the mere recommendation of the Navy Department, without investigation upon his part or without full and exhaustive investigation by naval experts and a committee charged with the duty of making such investigation, vote for an appropriation for completing the 15 or 16 battleships that were projected four or five years ago?

Mr. McKELLAR. With my very limited knowledge of such things, I think I should be guided by what the experts in our Navy Department may suggest about the matter. I desire to say that, so far as my own observation goes, the submarine is the most effective vessel in naval warfare. Germany made it so. My understanding has been that all during the war neither the British nor the American submarines were so well built nor quite so well equipped to enable them to do effective work, as were the German submarines. I think that was the general knowledge and experience of everybody. It seems to me that our Navy Department should develop the submarine so that we could have submarines which would be equal to the best and superior to the best, if that were possible.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have instituted no comparison as to the relative value of the capital ship and the submarine; both doubtless have their purpose. The point I am trying to make is that the experiences of the war have been of such a character as to call, in my judgment, for a revision of the prewar program, or, if not for a revision, at least for an exhaustive investigation to determine whether it would be wise in the light of the information which has come to us to continue the prewar program.

I have disapproved of the last two naval appropriation bills. I have felt that they called for entirely too great a program.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in 1918, after the war was over, the Navy Department itself suggested the possibility, if there was to be no action taken on disarmament, of a new program in addition to that of 1916, namely, the program known as that of 1918.

Mr. KING. I recall, Mr. President, the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, and I do not think that that recommendation met with the approval of the American people. I am sure that if it were to be renewed to-day it would meet universal condemnation in the United States; nor would such a recommendation deter me from the position which I am now assuming, namely, that there should be an exhaustive inquiry with a view to determining what our naval program should be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I dislike to interrupt the Senator so much, but I should like to ask him this question: Unless we have an agreement between England, Japan, and the United

States providing at least for partial disarmament, does not the Senator think that it would be very unwise not to continue for our protection the building up of our Navy according to the present plans? Would the Senator be willing that England and Japan should continue to build, as they are now doing, enormous navies, and that the United States should not go along in equal steps?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I believe the action of the United States will be followed by those nations; that is to say, if we adopt a policy of gradual disarmament and attempt in good faith to execute it; all other nations of the world will be guided by it. Let me say to my friend that my information is that Great Britain's naval program will be very much restricted from that which some of the naval officers of Great Britain desired should be followed. I have no doubt that if the United States restricts its naval program Japan will do the same.

Of course, if there should be a manifest purpose upon the part of other nations to continue to build capital ships and other war vessels we would be compelled, much as we might deplore the necessity, to make appropriations to build and maintain a Navy adequate and sufficient to meet any danger. But I am now only arguing for a full investigation as to what policy we should pursue. If the investigation proves that we should continue these heavy burdens for war vessels, we want to know the kind of vessels required. There is not that unanimity of opinion as to the types and the program to be adopted that should exist when hundreds of millions are involved and when a broad policy to guide the future is to be adopted.

The Senator from Idaho has called attention to the diversity of views of naval men. I know from my conversation with naval officers and with others that there is a contrariety of views as to the kind of vessels which we should construct. Is it not time that there should be an exhaustive investigation to determine what kind of vessels should be constructed, and whether we should adhere to the prewar program or whether we should adopt a modified one or an entirely different one?

The battle of Jutland has been referred to. The excellent book written by Admiral Jellicoe describing that famous battle furnishes, I think, strong evidence of the importance of developing the submarine. It shows how powerless the battleships are against these serpents of the deep; and there will also be recalled by Senators the terror of the British Admiralty when their fleet was in Scapa Flow and before the entrance to the harbor had been protected, for fear a little submarine might thread the mazes of the channel and enter the harbor, and destroy one or more of the great battleships constituting the Grand Fleet.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. Does the Senator think that the submarines had any decisive effect on the action at the Battle of Jutland?

Mr. KING. I think so; indirectly if not directly. If the Senator will permit me, the fear of the German submarines, as I recall the facts, deterred Admiral Jellicoe from continuing the battle or remaining in the vicinity until daylight, and it is quite likely that even if he had received the message which Admiral Beatty wired him, which called for a different plan than that which Admiral Jellicoe followed, I do not believe he would have responded to it, partly because of his apprehensions based upon the presence of submarines under the control of the German admiral.

Mr. GERRY. Admiral Jellicoe turned away from the German fleet in the Battle of Jutland in order to avoid torpedo attack from destroyers, not submarines. The result of that maneuver was that he was unable to come in close contact with the German fleet. If Admiral Jellicoe had pressed his advantage—as to which there is a controversy now—a different story might have been written in regard to the future submarine campaign. Of course, his action is a question of naval controversy at this time, and has been ever since the battle; but the deterrent effect upon Admiral Jellicoe, and the decisive force that deterred him in that battle, was not, as I recollect, the submarine, but destroyer attack.

Mr. KING. The controversy between the supporters of Admiral Beatty and the supporters of Admiral Jellicoe will continue as long as men are interested in naval warfare; but I venture the assertion, with all due deference to my distinguished friend, that a careful examination of the record made by Admiral Jellicoe—not only the report which he first made to the British Admiralty, but as he recorded the events in his most interesting book—will confirm the view which I expressed, that the submarines were regarded as a factor in that great battle, perhaps the greatest naval battle that the world has ever seen. It is quite likely their work was negative rather

than positive. I concede that the torpedo flotilla was of vital importance, and the British ships suffered greatly from their attacks.

Mr. GERRY. If the Senator will yield, the statements in regard to the battle and the controversy that is going on—not only the statements made in Admiral Jellicoe's own report but the statements in the reports of other naval officers and of other naval critics—show very clearly that in that battle the submarine played very little part. The Senator must know full well that that battle was fought with ships going at 20 knots or better—the battle cruisers, of course, were going a great deal faster—that a submarine, with the number of destroyers and the number of surface ships operating, would, if it should come close enough to torpedo a battleship, have to submerge; that the fastest that the German submarine or any other submarine that we know of at this time can proceed at under water is 12 knots. The result is that unless the submarine is ahead of the battle fleet, she can not come in contact with the battleship she wishes to attack. She is losing ground constantly. The battleship is going at least two knots to her one. The result of this is that a submarine attack, after she submerges, can be made only when the battleships happen to run across her course. With the Germans proceeding the way they were in the Battle of Jutland, at great speed, it was impossible, when the fleets met, for the submarines to be in great force to assist the German attack, and the result of that is very clearly brought out in the whole account of the battle; and I doubt if one vessel of importance was sunk in that battle by a submarine, although some warships were torpedoed. It was the destroyers that made the attack with the torpedoes, not the submarines.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator proceeds upon the theory that the battle at every stage was a running battle, at great speed, whereas the facts are that there were slow circling movements and many vessels were so injured that they dropped out of the fighting line. But I am not contending that in the battle itself the submarines were active or greatly important; but the fear of their presence, the knowledge that there were many between the German fleet and its base was in the mind of the British commanders and influenced them in the course which they followed.

There was the fear of the submarine lurking in those waters, and the British admiral did not deem it safe to pursue the German fleet in the direction of the harbor to which it fled.

Mr. GERRY. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe it would have been possible for the Germans to have prevented action and changed their course, returning to their own port, if it had not been for the destroyer attack, as I said before, and Admiral Jellicoe changing his course on account of that attack. Then, when he resumed his course, it was too late for him to come in contact with the German fleet before night.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is quite obvious that if two such experts as the Senator from Rhode Island and myself differ respecting that battle, there will be differences between supporters of Admiral Beatty and Admiral Jellicoe and the adherents of Admiral von Scheer.

Mr. GERRY. I will say to the Senator that I am quoting entirely from the reports.

Mr. KING. The Senator places one interpretation upon the reports, and I do not quite agree with my friend upon the interpretation which he places upon them.

I was about to add one word, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] has been pressing for some time a very important measure. I am not sure that I agree with it in all details; but the situation now is such as to require, in my opinion, some coordination of the activities of the War Department and the Navy Department with respect to the production of aircraft. I think it is a mistake to have two departments building airplanes. There ought to be coordination in the construction of naval and military planes. I am not so sure but that an interdepartmental bureau, consisting of naval officers and Army officers, and perhaps one or more civilians, should be created for the purpose of devising the naval and military aircraft. Certain it is that the war has demonstrated the importance of aircraft, and we must make suitable provisions for the construction of the best aircraft that can be produced in the world. There must be a coordination of the agencies engaged in devising and producing naval and military planes, to the end that efficiency and economies will result.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I inquire what is the matter before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business, the tariff bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I got an impression from the discussion that perhaps some other subject had been presented for the consideration of the Senate.

I desire to say at this time just a few words not upon the merits of the measure at all; but on Wednesday, at the conclusion of the morning business, I made a motion to proceed with the consideration of the measure that had heretofore been under discussion and consideration by the Senate, namely, S. 4746. Pending that motion the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] entered upon a discussion of the pending measure, and introduced his remarks with some comments on the appropriateness of the motion submitted by myself, presenting the view that the question addressed to the Senate was the relative importance of those two measures.

I do not care to have that condition of affairs go unchallenged. I very freely concede—indeed, I assert—that the pending measure is one of vastly greater importance than the one the consideration of which I sought to have at that time. Let me remark in that connection that the bill which was then under consideration is a bill the purpose of which is to change the law of the District of Columbia in relation to proceedings for forcible entry and unlawful detainer. The existing statute is an exceedingly drastic one, conceded I think even by its friends to be unusually unjustifiable, unnecessarily harsh with respect to tenants. The measure was reported by the Judiciary Committee, which thought an amendment to that law ought to be enacted.

It seemed a very small matter, and one that ought to be disposed of in a very short while. It received the consideration of the Senate something like two weeks ago, after the morning business had been transacted. Various amendments to the bill were proposed, they were discussed at some considerable length, and eventually either adopted or rejected, and the bill arrived at its final stage, and there only remained to be taken a final vote when the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] got the floor and consumed all the intervening time until the hour of 2 o'clock arrived, when the bill was displaced by the unfinished business before the Senate.

On last Tuesday practically the same proceeding was repeated. The bill was up for consideration after the disposition of the morning business, regularly before the Senate, and we went through with exactly the same procedure. After it had arrived at the final stage and the question was as to whether the bill should pass, the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] again took the floor and discussed the bill as though it were one which was then for the first time before the Senate. He discussed the general character of the bill, the general merits of the bill, and the usual statutes relating to forcible entry and unlawful detainer, and so on, until the hour of 2 o'clock arrived, when, according to the rules of the Senate, it was again displaced.

Those of us who are not unfamiliar with such a procedure had no hesitancy in arriving at the conclusion that the Senator from Washington, who is, for some reason or other, opposed to the bill, took that method of killing it, and it occurred to me that inasmuch as the discussion of the subject had been exhausted, as I thought, upon two separate days, if we could only keep the bill before the Senate for 10 minutes, the pressure upon the Senator from Washington from the friends of the present measure would be so powerful that he would desist from further discussion and we would have a vote on that bill.

So I desire to advise the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that it was not upon the theory at all that the bill to amend the procedure in actions of forcible entry and unlawful detainer in the District of Columbia was of importance to the country greater than that of the pending measure, that I pressed the motion at that time. It was simply in the hope, and I may say in the expectation, that if the bill were kept before the Senate for 15 minutes more we should have been able to dispose of it either one way or the other, either to vote it up or vote it down, and then the regular unfinished business would come before the Senate.

I desire particularly to advise the Senator from North Dakota that I have no disposition at all to embarrass the presentation and discussion of the pending measure, and I have no part in any parliamentary purpose to obstruct its speedy determination.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is not often that I have anything to say about matters sectional. Somehow or other sectional matters have never appealed to me very greatly in my service in Congress. I am quite sure, so far as I can recall, that during the nearly 10 years I have served in the two branches of the Congress I have never mentioned a sectional

matter, and I would not do so now except for some statements which have been made, and but for a bill which has been introduced in another body which would very vitally affect the people of my State.

When I say I have not discussed sectional matters, it does not mean that I do not love the part of the country from which I come, for I do with all my heart, just as I love the whole country. As I feel about it, I put Americanism before sectionalism.

But we ought to be fair about such things, and I want to call the Senate's attention at this time very briefly to an article which has recently appeared, which I believe will make us all feel just a little bit more considerate of the various sections, and make us feel how easy and unfair it is to criticize others without knowing all the facts. The fact shown in this article is an exemplification of the good old Scriptural doctrine that we frequently see notes in other people's eyes without discovering the beams that are within our own.

The article is entitled "As Hartford sees us," and is taken from the Nashville Tennessean of January 24, 1921, and reads as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Monday morning, Jan. 24, 1921.]

AS HARTFORD SEES US.

The press of the United States, and especially that part of it which is hostile to the South, has had considerable to say on disfranchisement and reduction of Southern representation in Congress since Congressman TINKHAM introduced his South-baiting resolution.

There is nothing new in what the New England press has to say of us, but it is rarely that we see so frank a statement as that which appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Times:

"If Negroes are to exercise their rights under the Constitution, they can drive out of power every officeholder in the extreme Southern States. As they become more dissatisfied over their impotence in political affairs, and if they can see no change in the South, they will come North, thus depriving the South of labor which it needs."

The statements of New Englanders have gone unchallenged so long that a comparison of election restrictions of that group of States with the 11 States of the so-called "solid South" may be of interest.

In the New England group there are six States. Each and every one of those States has hedged the ballot box with restrictions. They are: Connecticut: Good moral character. Ability to read the Constitution.

Maine: Ability to read the Constitution and write name. Paupers and persons under guardianship are denied the right to vote.

Massachusetts: Ability to read the Constitution and write name. Poll tax.

I stop long enough to say that if we had that law in Tennessee there would be many more deprived of the right to vote than are deprived there now under our law. The law of Tennessee, so far as Negroes voting is concerned, is very much more liberal than the law in Massachusetts, the home of my friend Congressman TINKHAM. The article continues:

New Hampshire: Ability to read Constitution and write name. Paupers and nontaxpayers are denied the right to vote.

Rhode Island: Property qualification. Paupers and persons under guardianship denied right to vote. Registry tax of \$1 required.

Vermont: Good behavior. Ex-Confederates are denied right to vote.

Four out of the six States have educational qualifications; three out of the six insist upon the ability to read and write; two bar nontaxpayers; and one disfranchises ex-Confederates, the only other State in the Union to have a similar law being Kansas.

In the Southern group there are 11 States. One of them, Kentucky, has no restrictions. The others are:

Arkansas: Poll tax.

Alabama: Property or ability to read and write, and employment.

Florida: Ability to read Constitution and write name.

Georgia: Ability to read.

Louisiana: Property or ability to read and write.

Mississippi: Ability to read or explain the Constitution. Poll tax.

Delinquent taxpayers denied the right to vote.

North Carolina: Ability to read and write. Poll tax.

South Carolina: Ability to read and write for persons not registered prior to January 1, 1898. Poll tax.

Tennessee: Poll tax.

Virginia: Poll tax.

Six of the 10 other States have poll-tax requirements; 7 have educational requirements, but 2 of these relieve voters of the ability to read and write if they are property owners; 2 States have optional property requirements, but none makes it mandatory.

In Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia it is easier to vote than it is in any single State of the New England group.

Taken as a group the restrictions of the New England States are much harder than those of the South.

With the exception of Mississippi, there is no Southern State which can compete with the New Hampshire voting requirements, and where Mississippi denies the right of voting to delinquent taxpayers, the greater number of those deprived of suffrage are whites, by reason of the percentage of property ownership in their favor.

If the Hartford Times advises the Negro to drive out the white officeholders in the extreme South, and, failing, to move North, the Hartford Times must not object if the Negro follows that advice when he goes North and drives the whites from political power there.

New England is a long way from the South. The "down-easter" does not understand either the Negro or the South.

The South understands the Negro, and the Negro understands the South. The southerner is eager and willing to help him if he will help himself.

The only Negro problem in the South is the problem presented by the busybodies, whose sole interest in the Negro is to use him to attract the spot light of publicity. Social climbers nowadays "go in" for things. The Negro is New England's social toy.

If the Hartford Times will take the trouble to investigate the family trees of some of those who are lamenting the lot of the Negro, it undoubtedly will find that those who are shedding crocodile tears for the disfranchised Negro are enjoying the fortunes which their forebears accumulated in the African slave trade.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator has just called attention to the article he has read to the iniquitous provision which exists in the Rhode Island law in regard to the qualifications of voters; I refer to the property qualification. I will say, for the Senator's information, that the Democratic Party in my State for years has fought for the abolition of that qualification, and that even Republican governors have, in their messages to the legislature, recommended its abolition. But, unfortunately, the Republican legislature, which has been in control in my State for many years, has always turned a deaf ear to this plea of our people.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That opens up a very interesting inquiry, and I desire to address a question to the Senator from Rhode Island. My recollection is that at the time the Constitution of the United States was adopted practically every one of the 13 States had a property qualification in its statutes in relation to suffrage. These were one by one modified so as to grant the right of suffrage without reference to the ownership of property.

Mr. McKELLAR. Rhode Island, I think, is the only State which still has such a qualification.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It was not accomplished, of course, without a struggle. It may be recalled that the State of Maryland was the pioneer in the new Democratic movement to remove the property qualification to the right of suffrage, and that the enactment of the statute so incensed Justice Chase, of the Supreme Court of the United States, that he indulged in a very bitter harangue at the circuit where he was holding court against the Legislature of the State of Maryland for enacting so revolutionary a statute, evidently leading, as he thought, to the disruption of all government.

His charges thus made became the foundation for impeachment proceedings that were subsequently instituted against him.

I was interested to know just exactly what are the considerations which thus have induced the State of Rhode Island during all this long course of years to retain an obsolete system so inconsistent with modern Democratic ideas.

Mr. GERRY. I will say to the Senator from Montana that it is purely for the purpose of political control.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I not add also that one of the purposes for these qualifications in various States of the Union has been to prevent the immigrant class from being readily and speedily given an opportunity to exercise the franchise?

Mr. McKELLAR. All of which goes to show that it is a local question in the various States. One State desires to exclude one class and another State another class. I wished to call the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that, so far as the laws are concerned, the New England laws are very much more severe in denying the right of suffrage than those in the community from which I come. If all the Negroes, without regard to literacy, migrated to the New England States I am sure that under the laws above set out they would be deprived of their voting privileges more than they are now deprived in my section, and especially in my State. The various sections of our country should be fair one to the other.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Florida pardon me while I yield to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to suggest to the Senator that inasmuch as we have discussed everything this afternoon from Negroes to battleships, will not the Senator kindly give us his views in some way upon the bill which we have before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope to do that before the debate is closed. I understood from Senators on your side, I believe the chairman of the committee among others, that the fullest latitude was to be given for the debate on the subject. The subject of the tariff is a very complicated one and deserves the most careful and painstaking scrutiny. We should not hurriedly and thoughtlessly put into effect these prohibitive rates. Each should have careful investigation and discussion. Only two subjects, I believe, wheat and sugar, have as yet been discussed at all. Much latitude in debate should be allowed.

Mr. McCUMBER. If that latitude, of course, includes discussion of the Negro problem, the battleship program, and so forth, the discussion of the Senator is well within the limits.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is in accord with the customs of the Senate as I have found them to be since I came here, I will say to the Senator. I have known few, if any, bills of any importance to pass without other matters being discussed during such consideration. It may be a bad practice, but it is one of the favorite practices of the Senate, as we all know. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. The State of Florida was mentioned by the Senator in this connection. I wish to state that the election laws in Florida provide for the qualification of voters that they shall be registered, that they shall pay a poll tax, and that they shall vote the secret ballot under the Australian ballot system. It applies to black and white and everybody else. There is no discrimination whatever.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does it apply to all counties in the State?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; to all counties.

I wish to read from an editorial recently published in the Florida Times-Union, as follows:

The laws of the State of Florida make no discrimination whatever on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. There is no prerequisite to the exercise of the right of suffrage that applies to the black man that does not apply to the white man. The law is such as to discriminate against ignorance, but it discriminates against white ignorance just as much as against black ignorance.

That discrimination against ignorance means that each elector is required to go into a booth and mark his own ballot secretly and without any communication with anyone else.

A discrimination of this kind which is now treated as an offense, was considered both right and desirable when this State and a number of others adopted systems that were intended to keep from voting men who could not read their ballots and mark them properly. It was called an electoral reform then and it would be classed as such now by the Republicans who are attacking the South if States that voted the Republican ticket were in question.

That is a clear statement of the situation in Florida.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] a moment ago suggested to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that we ought to begin a discussion of the tariff question and lay off of the Negro, as he terms him, and the battleships for awhile. The Democratic side of the aisle has been waiting all day, or, at least, since the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] made his very able speech revealing the iniquities of the present so-called emergency tariff bill, for some one on the other side of the aisle who favors the legislation to speak in its behalf. We were in hopes, and we still have hopes, that some one on that side of the aisle will give some reason to the Senate for some of the provisions which are embodied in the so-called emergency tariff bill. The only justification that has been offered for any provision in the bill is with reference to wheat, and that was offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McKELLAR. What other speeches have been made in favor of the tariff bill except the speech of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. The so-called emergency tariff legislation includes 18 various articles or more, including sugar, cottonseed oil, cotton, fresh meat, live stock, hides, shoes, and innumerable other propositions that mean so much to the American people and are so important, none of the provisions with reference to which have been justified or attempted to be justified in a speech upon the floor of the Senate by a single Senator on the other side of the aisle, except the Senator from North Dakota on the question of wheat alone.

Mr. SIMMONS. And yet they are ready for a vote right now.

Mr. HARRISON. And yet the Senators on that side are crying for a vote. We all know what that means. I have been trying for three days to get the floor to make a speech here, and I can not do it because Senators intervene and interrupt.

Yesterday the Senate recessed over my protest and over the protest of this side of the aisle. I was in the midst of a speech, I was deeply interested in it, my mind concentrated upon it, trying to reveal the iniquities of the proposition and point out to the American people the infamy of the act of the Republican majority here in trying to impose this greater burden upon the backs of the tolling masses and the consumers of the land, when the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], with all the majesty that he possesses and the great power of the chairmanship of the Committee on Finance, interrupted me and got

into almost a wordy controversy with the Presiding Officer over his right to suggest the absence of a quorum so that he might ask the Senate to take a recess.

There was a majority on this side of the aisle who did not want to take a recess, who did not want any suggestion of the absence of a quorum to be made in the midst of a Senator's speech about the infamous provisions of the bill, and yet a recess was taken. So I am going to ask now, because at the time I was discussing the sugar provisions when the Senator from Louisiana interrupted me, to have read at the desk a very interesting article that appeared in the Evening World of January 20 on the very important question of sugar. I know that the Senator from North Dakota respects the views of this great American paper and that the Senate will be edified to hear what it says. It is headed "Trick tariff sugar boost recalls threat of trust, 'Our losses must be paid.'" I ask to have it read from the Secretary's desk.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Pending the reading of the article, I desire to inquire of the Senator from Mississippi about the proceedings here to-day. I was obliged to be absent a good portion of the day in connection with the work of one of the committees of the Senate. My understanding is that the discussion of the naval program, which took up a good portion of the afternoon, was precipitated by some remarks made by a Senator upon the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I will say to the Senator from Montana, made a very eloquent and very able speech upon that question and started the discussion, after the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] had made his very able speech on the emergency tariff bill, which was not attempted to be answered by any Senator on the other side of the aisle. They sat in their seats dumbfounded and made no reply to it, and would not even ask the Senator questions so that he might reveal the various misrepresentations which they are trying to put forth to the American people.

I ask that the article I have sent to the desk may be read.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

TRICK TARIFF SUGAR BOOST RECALLS THREAT OF TRUST, "OUR LOSSES MUST BE PAID"—FORDNEY MEASURE'S TAX ON CONSUMERS, \$366,000,000, WOULD JUST COVER LOSSES OF SUGAR INTERESTS WHEN GOUGING PLANS COLLAPSED.

WASHINGTON, January 20.

The ultimate consumer received due notice of what Congress was going to do to protect the sugar interests, which, through greed and the exercise of bad judgment, had sustained immense losses, as long ago as the end of last September. At that time Edwin F. Atkins, an official of the American Sugar Refining Co., who has since allied himself with another big sugar concern, said in an interview:

"The fall in raw-sugar prices between July 1 and September 15 of this year (1920) has caused a loss of \$250,000,000, which some one must stand."

The "some one" who has been selected by the sugar interests and their financial allies and their allies in the Congress of the United States to stand the loss has been identified. He is the purchaser of sugar at retail, and, as the Evening World revealed yesterday, he is expected to pay off the loss at the rate of 4 cents a pound, which is the increase in the price of sugar the Fordney emergency tariff bill would bring about.

Since the time Mr. Atkins gave out his interview the losses of the sugar interests have mounted to approximately \$365,000,000. That the Fordney bill would impose a direct tax of about \$366,000,000 on the people is illustrative of the fact that the gentlemen who prepared the sugar amendment are in pretty close touch with the sugar interests that want to be reimbursed by the people for their business losses.

The statement of the Evening World that the passage of the Fordney bill would automatically raise the retail price of sugar 4 cents a pound has been attacked by the sponsors of the sugar amendment, as a matter of course. But the Evening World's statement is based not only on information obtained from the best authorities in the country but on the amendment itself.

FIGURES PROVE CONTEMPLATED 4-CENT RAISE.

The amendment provides for a tax on raw sugar material not above 75° test by the polariscope of 2.13 cents a pound—this in addition to the existing tax of 1.004 cents a pound on imports from Cuba and 1.256 cents a pound on imports from other countries. The object of the bill is to drive Cuban sugar from the market in the United States until the present surplus supply is exhausted.

The bill further provides that for every additional degree of test over 75° there shall be imposed an additional tax of .078 of a cent. It happens that practically all the sugar affected by the sugar amendment in the Fordney bill is 96 per cent test. Therefore the bill actually imposes a tax of 2.13 cents a pound plus two times seventy-eight one-thousandths of a cent, making a total tax of 3.77 cents per pound. In other words, the bill, which professes to tax 75 per cent sugar, actually taxes 96 per cent sugar, and the difference between 96 points and 75 points is 21 points, and these 21 points add 1.64 cents to the nominal rate of 2.13 cents.

The sugar experts say that when the beneficiaries of the Fordney legislation tack the extra tax on their price they will make it an even number addition and charge 4 cents instead of 3.77 cents. Of course, this will amount to considerable of an extra profit when the vast amount of sugar involved is taken into consideration. It amounts to almost a quarter of a cent a pound, and a quarter of a cent a pound on an estimated consumption of 8,960,000,000 pounds makes a trifle of \$22,400,000 which the sugar barons will pick up on the side—in the event of the passage of the Fordney bill.

PALMER'S MISTAKE IN HELPING LOUISIANA GROWERS.

On the 10th of last October it was quite apparent to everybody in the sugar business that the market was glutted with sugar beyond the point of immediate absorption. In other words, the supply was away ahead of the demand. There started from Washington to New York about that date the "flying squadron" of the Department of Justice to expose food profiteers in the metropolis. With the "squadron" was John B. Floyd, who had the title of statistician. Mr. Floyd on reaching New York said:

"The people of the United States will pass through another period of short supply of sugar before the end of the year and in the early months of 1921, I have no doubt."

We are now in the early months of 1921 and the surplus supply of sugar in the country amounts to 1,250,000 tons despite the predictions of a shortage by a statistician on the Government pay roll. Perhaps the accuracy of this prediction explains why all inquiries about the beet-sugar industry which reach the Agricultural Department are turned over to Truman G. Parker, who is very well known in Washington. Mr. Parker is a lobbyist for the beet-sugar interests. The authority for this comes from men in the sugar industry.

G. O. P. LOBBY IN HURRY TO PASS BILL.

Senator PENROSE's declaration to the Senate yesterday that he intends to hurry the passage of the Fordney emergency tariff bill indicates that the men back of the measure want to rush it through before the people have a chance to learn what it is all about. The Evening World's exposé of the real motive of the measure—the reimbursement of the sugar interests and their allied financial institutions—has already set up some formidable hurdles in the path of the rush program, although the Evening World correspondent is informed that a canvass has been made and that Representative FORDNEY and Senators GAY, SMOOR, and PENROSE believe they have the votes to put the bill over.

Their hopes lie in the fact that they have taken care of every agricultural and stock-raising interest that has suffered business losses. The bill looks out for the wheat grower, the tobacco grower, the cotton grower, the frozen-meat industry, the butter and egg industry, and so on. It touches the interests of every Member of Congress having an agricultural constituency. To these is held out the implied threat that if they oppose the sugar amendment, the amendment in which they are most vitally interested is in danger. The word has been passed that the bill will have to go through in its entirety.

The original Fordney bill has been passed by the House. But after it reached the Senate Committee on Finance amendments were tacked onto it. Seven of these amendments were added last Saturday.

The trickery underlying the bill is shown by a statement given out to the Washington correspondents on Saturday that the increase on sugar would amount to only 2.63 per hundred pounds until the retail price reaches 10 cents a pound. The Evening World has shown that the increase to be passed along to the consumer amounts to 4 cents a pound and that the provision that the retail price shall not exceed 10 cents a pound is of no value, because it is made to apply to a condition that will not exist.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the article which has just been read into the RECORD, after reciting the losses that have been incurred by the Sugar Trust, stated, in substance, that those who framed the particular amendment to the bill were very much in touch with the interest which desired to recoup those losses and to have the recouping done at the expense of the ultimate consumer. I do not believe that those who framed the amendment had anything to do or were in any respect in touch with the great sugar interests or the refining companies. It is in evidence which has been presented again and again before the Senate that there is a loss to the beet-sugar interests in Utah of about \$4 per ton in manufacturing beets into sugar; there is also a heavy loss in Louisiana among the cane growers. In view of that condition, the Senators from Louisiana presented the matter of protection for sugar to the Committee on Finance. The Committee on Finance was impressed with the logic of their arguments and the necessity for the amendment; and so, although there was a difference of opinion, the committee by a majority vote inserted in the bill the amendment which was sponsored by the two Senators from Louisiana. I am certain that neither of those Senators has ever talked with a representative of the Sugar Trust or has performed his duties actuated by a desire to serve the particular interests of the refining companies.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I have a great deal of confidence in the Senator from North Dakota and in his desire to legislate for the interest of the American people. I have no doubt he has studied the question with much care, and I should like to ask him, in the light of his study of the question, what effect the pending tariff bill, if it shall be enacted into law, will have, directly and indirectly, upon the sugar purchaser—that is, the consuming public in the United States—to what extent will it raise prices?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think temporarily it will raise prices, and naturally so.

Mr. KING. Has the Senator any idea how much the tariff duty will cost the consuming public and how much it will inure to the advantage of the sugar producer?

Mr. McCUMBER. To-day, Mr. President, it is a question of life and death to the cane-sugar producers. I believe in maintaining the sugar industry of the United States; I think in the end it will be beneficial to do so. I think it may cost the

American public a little more just now to purchase their sugar should the bill become a law, but I think it is better that we should make the sugar industry in this country self-sustaining.

Mr. KING. Has the Senator from North Dakota any idea how many millions, tens of millions, or hundreds of millions of dollars will be added to the burdens of the purchasers of sugar as a result of the enactment of this measure?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think it will be very few hundreds of millions, if it adds to their burdens at all. There are those on the committee, Mr. President, who are very much better informed as to the sugar industry than I myself am, and I will allow them to answer the question of the Senator from Utah. However, the Senator from Utah comes from a sugar-producing State, and I should be glad to have his opinion on the subject. If he sees reasons why this bill should not be enacted into law and sees in it any injustice to the consumers of the country, being interested in the subject, and sugar being a very important production of his own State, undoubtedly the Senator has more information on the subject, when it comes down to mere estimates of cost, than I myself have.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I was expressing no opinion in regard to the merits or demerits of the bill; neither have I had the advantage which the Senator has had of hearing the testimony which has been offered in support of the bill. He is a distinguished member of the important Committee on Finance; he has given years of study to tariff problems, and I was wondering whether information had been adduced before the committee that would show the additional cost to the buyers of sugar in the United States that would result from the passage of this bill. If no such testimony has been offered, then, of course, I shall not press my friend to answer the question.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think there was testimony offered on that subject, but I have it not before me.

Mr. KING. May I ask one other question of the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator called attention to the fact that unless this measure was passed the sugar industry in the South might suffer materially. May I ask the Senator whether it was the purpose of the Finance Committee to take care of all business enterprises in the United States in all lines of industry that were suffering during the present period of readjustment? I may say to the Senator before he answers that question, if that be true, then we should take care of the laboring men who are thrown out of employment; we should take care of the retailers who without fault have sustained great losses; we should take care of the cotton growers who have been compelled to sell their cotton, if they could find a market at all, at less than the cost price; we should be compelled to pay the woolgrowers compensation, perhaps by an appropriation for the losses which they have sustained. In other words, does not the Senator think that if we predicate our legislation upon the theory of making reparation for injuries which have been the result of the application of economic laws, we are not only prostituting the powers of the Federal Government, but we are going far beyond what we can possibly accomplish?

Mr. McCUMBER. I can answer the Senator, and answer him very briefly, indeed. The question has been answered several times.

The purpose of the committee was to afford relief to the agricultural industries of the United States, both in the matter of grain raising and sheep raising and stock raising, because we believed that they were suffering more from importations than any other industry in the United States, because we believed that the depression in the prices was due not alone to the present importations but to the immense importations which were about to come into the country; and we felt certain that as the American grain producer, for instance, can produce all of the grain that is necessary to be consumed in the United States, and as grain is coming in that is being produced very much cheaper than it can be produced in the United States, we ought to give to the American farmer as much as we could the American market until he could be placed upon his feet again.

These conditions will not last forever, of course, and we hope that the present deplorable conditions will be very short-lived; but we are certain that they are affected very materially by the vast imports and threatened imports that are coming into the country. I have left the matter of the discussion of the sugar schedule and all that affects the sugar interests to those members of the committee who, like the Senator himself, have greater expert knowledge upon that subject than I have.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit just one question, and then I shall subside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has alluded to the importations of grain, and I suppose he alludes to the importations from Canada. I ask for information. Does not the record show that, taking it during the past year, our exportations to Canada of cereals and the various forms of cereals were substantially the same as the importations of cereals?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think not. I do not care about entering upon the discussion of that matter at this time, but according to the testimony of the Senator from North Carolina our exports to Canada would be very much lower. What I want to get at, however, is what the Senator bases his figures upon, and whether he includes tobacco, which, of course, is imported almost exclusively from the United States.

Mr. KING. The Senator will keep in mind the fact that I limited my interrogatory to cereals and the various forms of cereals. The reason why I make the inquiry is because the information which I have is that our exports of cereals in all forms to Canada are substantially the same as the importations from Canada. There is, perhaps, a difference of \$20,000,000 during the year.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me answer just that one matter. We do not export one bushel of wheat into Canada to be consumed in Canada.

Mr. KING. No; but we export flour and various forms of cereals.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; our American mills have been able, as long as the prices were quite similar between the two countries, by reason of possibly cheaper manufacture in the United States, to compete in the eastern market of Canada with American flour, and there has been considerable flour exported into Canada, and that has been the case right along for years—not merely this year, not merely last year, but for 50 years.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator will find upon full investigation—and, of course, I assume he has made it—that the exports of grain from the United States in flour and all cereal forms will total approximately in value what we have imported from Canada; and moreover, as the Senator from North Carolina has stated, Canada is one of our large purchasers, being the third on the list. I have no doubt, of course, that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has had in mind, in the consideration of this bill, the effect of our attempting to interdict trade with Canada, and the possibility of reprisals upon our commerce, the result of which might be disastrous to the manufacturing interests as well as other interests in the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has not only had it in mind, but he discussed it fully two days ago, and does not wish to repent what he said at that time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from North Dakota will let me ask him a question before he sits down.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, am I recognized for a moment? I have been trying to ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota. I will take but a moment, if the Senator will pardon me.

The Senator from North Dakota was answering this article in the paper, and referred to the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL and Mr. GAY] as being the men who placed the sugar amendment in this bill. Did I understand the Senator to say that?

Mr. McCUMBER. Both Senators were necessarily before the committee and urged this sugar tariff.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, neither of the Senators from Louisiana is on the Finance Committee. Neither of them had a vote in that committee. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCUMBER. They satisfied the majority of the committee of the righteousness of their contention.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but neither of those Senators was on the Finance Committee. That is my recollection.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why, certainly not.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from North Dakota voted for this provision in the committee, did he not? The Senator is in favor of this provision in the bill, is he not?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am in favor of every provision in the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is in favor of this provision in the bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. And this provision.

Mr. HARRISON. And voted for it in the committee?

Mr. McCUMBER. And voted for it in the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. That was my question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have not the floor. I have answered questions when Senators asked me questions, but I have not the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wanted to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the Senator from North Dakota has surrendered the floor, and declines to resume it again for that purpose.

Mr. McCUMBER. I shall be pleased to answer questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina can take the floor in his own right if he desires to do so.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has just stated that he will be pleased to answer questions, and I will ask him a question. I will ask him, because I really want to know what the Senator's statement was. I am afraid I misunderstood him, and I wanted to ask him with a view of finding out whether or not I have misunderstood his statement.

I understood the Senator to say, and I wanted to ask him if he meant that, that the sugar men had lost large sums of money and were in a very distressful condition, and that he thought it was better that the general public should bear those losses than that the sugar interests should bear them. Am I correct in that understanding of the Senator's statement?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I have not made any such statement.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, I misunderstood the Senator. I thought that was the purport of his statement, and if that was the purport of his statement I thought it was a very remarkable statement.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, the Louisiana Senators seem to have been brought into this controversy, and I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for coming so generously and nobly to their relief. My colleague [Mr. GAY] introduced the amendment which has been the subject of so much criticism this afternoon. The reference in the New York World of January 20 is to this effect:

That the Fordney bill will impose a direct tax of about \$366,000,000 on the people is illustrative of the fact that the gentlemen who prepared the sugar amendment are in pretty close touch with the sugar interests that want to be reimbursed by the people for their business losses.

I do not know what that means, Mr. President, but if it intends to convey the idea that the Senators from Louisiana have any connection whatsoever with the so-called big sugar interests of the United States, I wish to deny it most emphatically. The amendment in question was prepared by my colleague [Mr. GAY], who lives in the sugar section of our State. It was prepared solely for the purpose of trying to lessen the awful losses which the sugar growers of Louisiana are suffering at the present time and with the purpose of including sugar in the emergency tariff bill, if we are to have such legislation to safeguard the suffering agricultural interests of this land; and that is the purpose of the pending emergency tariff bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. RANDELL. I will yield in a moment. If we are to have emergency tariff legislation—and that seemed to be the general opinion of the House of Representatives, which passed the pending bill by a good majority—the Louisiana Senators thought that sugar, which is in just as critical a condition as any other agricultural interest, should be included in it. The amendment was introduced by Senator GAY and pressed before the Finance Committee with all the force which my colleague and myself possessed, assisted by a delegation of our prominent cane growers. If there were any representatives of the so-called big sugar interests pressing this amendment before that committee, I never heard of it. I know there were none present when we were there. That is all I can say. I am not a member of the committee, and I do not know what may have been done by the big sugar interests; but I do know that the Louisiana Senators have no connection with them, and it is outrageous that we should be charged, even by innuendo, with doing anything improper when we try to look after the interests of our constituents and see that they are properly and fairly treated in a measure pending before Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course I know that the Senators from Louisiana had no improper motive with reference to this matter; but the Senator made the statement a while ago

that the purpose of that amendment was, in substance, to recoup the producers of sugar for the tremendous losses that they had sustained.

Mr. RANDELL. To prevent them from suffering terrible losses. Some of them, I will say to the Senator, have their sugar yet on hand. Now, if they are going to lose 8 or 10 cents a pound, as they undoubtedly will if it is sold at present prices, and if this amendment will result in their getting 2 cents a pound—not 4, as indicated in this article of the New York World—a fraction over 2 cents a pound more—would that not mean a loss of 2 cents a pound less, which is a very considerable item?

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator said, as I understood him, that this amendment was for the purpose of protecting them against the tremendous losses that they have sustained; and I want to ask the Senator if he believes it is a proper function of tariff legislation or a proper exercise of the power of taxation to protect people against losses and enable them to recoup the losses that they have already sustained?

Mr. RANDELL. I would like to ask the Senator, in reply to that question, what is the purpose of this tariff legislation? It is an emergency tariff bill to assist the agricultural interests. The agricultural interests of this country are in the slough of despond, about to be destroyed, and the country depends upon agriculture. If we can pass emergency legislation which will diminish the awful losses, which some of the best experts say amount within the past six months to \$8,000,000,000; if we can do something by law to lessen this appalling decline in value of farm products, I will ask the Senator if he does not think it our duty as legislators to pass such legislation? I certainly think so.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator asks me what is the purpose of this legislation. I will tell him that one of the purposes of it is to deceive and mislead the people of the country, the farming element of the country, with reference to the benefits of tariff protection. Another one of the objects of it, with respect to sugar, is to pass the losses of the sugar industry from the people who have sustained those losses onto the consumers who are hereafter to purchase their products.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not this bill was gotten up to deceive the American people, but I certainly do not think so, and I am supporting it in good faith. Perhaps the Senator has satisfied himself that his charge is correct. I assume he thinks it is correct or he never would have made it. I do not think Congress often gets up legislation to deceive people.

But, be that as it may, it seems to me that this legislation may be very beneficial. I hope and believe it will prove so. It is known to all that the world is going through the greatest business and financial crisis of modern times. We are going through it not alone in the Old World, but also in America. Never have there been such hard times in many parts of the world as now. I hope they are going to get better; and this bill is an attempt—in my opinion, an honest attempt—to relieve agriculture in America.

Mr. President, I would dislike to believe that the many good men of both parties who voted for this bill in the House of Representatives—and many of the best Democrats there voted for it—were guilty of enacting a piece of deceptive legislation. Such a proposition is monstrous. They may have erred in judgment. All of us are liable to make mistakes. Possibly the proposed legislation is unwise. If so, it will not be the first piece of unwise legislation enacted by the American Congress. On its face it purports to relieve agriculture—a calling in which nearly one-half of our people are engaged—now in desperate straits.

If agriculture be destroyed, if it becomes so unprofitable that the people abandon the farms in very much greater numbers than they have in the past, if they flock into the cities in such large numbers that the productive capacity of the farms is very seriously reduced during the next 12 months, then I ask Senators what will happen. We will produce less food than we are obliged to have for the consumption of the people; we will bring about a most unfortunate state of affairs. There must be a balance between the country and the city, between the country producer and the city consumer, and if we are going to permit by our failure to legislate, a state of affairs in our great Republic so unfortunate to the producer that he can not earn a decent living or get a fair return for his labor, then, sirs, he is going to abandon the farm. That is what I believe this bill is calculated to prevent. It takes in practically every kind of agriculture. In the form in which the Senate has amended it it reaches nearly every farm industry. It is not local, it is not sectional, it is broad, it is comprehensive, it is

far-reaching. It is calculated, sir, to satisfy the American farmer. It is calculated, sir, to give him hope.

It will soon be time to put the seed in the ground in my section of the country. A letter from home to-day tells me that the weather is good, and that everybody is plowing, getting ready to plant the coming crop. If we can not do something to give hope to the millions of farmers who have lost so heavily, I repeat that many of them will abandon the pursuit of agriculture. There can be no higher purpose or object of legislation than to promote the interests of such vast numbers of people, especially that great class known as agriculturists.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RANDELL. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Can the Senator tell why the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], in sending to the desk the article from the New York World, had stricken out all that part of the article referring to "Palmer's mistake in helping Louisiana growers"?

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator from Mississippi is in the Chamber—

Mr. HARRISON. I did not want to embarrass the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. I was not in the Chamber when the article was presented.

Mr. HARRISON. Is that a candid answer?

Mr. SMOOT. Very candid; and it was exactly what I expected it was done for. But when I put an article in the RECORD I want to put it all in; I do not want to put half of it in.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator wants the other half read, I have no objection. I wanted to be courteous to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. I will say to the Senator that I thank him very much; but Mr. Palmer has very broad shoulders. He is usually able to take care of himself. It would not embarrass me in the slightest degree, nor do I think it would embarrass Mr. Palmer, our very able and efficient Attorney General, for this criticism to go in the RECORD. He has been criticized so much that criticism slips off his shoulders like water off a duck's back.

Mr. HARRISON. I would be glad if that part of the article may be read.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me say—

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from Utah would have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I have none whatever.

Mr. HARRISON. Let us get it in the RECORD, and then we can discuss Mr. Palmer. May I suggest that the lines touching Mr. Palmer and the Louisiana grower be read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Secretary will read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first line stricken through is: Special from a staff correspondent of the Evening World.

The next is under the heading, "Palmer's mistake in helping Louisiana growers," and reads as follows:

The attitude of the administration has been singularly stupid on sugar. For instance, when Attorney General Palmer ruled that consumers in the southern territory served by the Louisiana planters should pay twice as much for their sugar as consumers on the Atlantic seaboard; the retail price of sugar in Atlanta, Ga., soared to 42 cents a pound, and it was undoubtedly higher in smaller communities. New Yorkers were getting sugar then at 23 cents a pound retail.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi if there is not any more truth in the charge made against Mr. Palmer than in some of the figures quoted in that article, it will never do Mr. Palmer any harm.

Mr. HARRISON. I think that is true; and that is why I have condemned the literature issued by the Republican campaign committee, which charged practically what is there charged, and which now the Senator from Utah condemns.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say there was not any truth in it, but it is exaggerated; the rates in that article are exaggerated.

Mr. HARRISON. Exactly as they were exaggerated in the campaign literature of the Senator's party.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the construction the Senator may put on it; but I do not think there was an exaggeration in that literature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brandegee	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Heflin	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Smoot
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Poinexter	Stanley
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Trammell
Dillingham	Keyes	Ransdell	Underwood
Elkins	King	Robinson	Wadsworth
Gerry	Knox	Sheppard	Warren
Gooding	McCumber	Shields	Willis
Hale	McKellar	Simmons	

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. GRONNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. SUTHERLAND answered to their names when called.

Mr. FERNALD entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. COLT, and Mr. TOWNSEND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania withhold his motion to enable me to submit a report from the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. PENROSE. I yield for that purpose.

COPPER HARBOR RANGE LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, MICH.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 14122) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Copper Harbor Range Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., to Houghton and Keweenaw Counties, Mich. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. This is a bill to which there is no objection. It provides for the sale of a portion of the reservation to the counties named. The Government approves the sale. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read.

Mr. HARRISON. Can not the Senator call up the bill in the morning?

Mr. TOWNSEND. If there is any objection I shall not insist on its consideration now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not understand the Senator from Michigan. Is it his desire to have the bill passed?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do desire to have the bill passed. It is a bill which passed the House some time ago and it is now favorably reported. There is no objection to it anywhere. It simply provides for the sale of a portion of the lighthouse reservation in the upper region of Michigan.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It has been favorably reported by the Senate committee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It was unanimously reported from the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS.

Mr. PENROSE. I renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 28, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 27, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Dr. Couden has requested that until his resignation takes effect Dr. Montgomery may substitute for him.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., of the Calvary Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we beseech Thee to hear us. On the breath of our prayer is the confession of our sins. Deepen our sympathies toward all men who fail. Broaden our understanding of all the needs and problems of our country and heighten our aspirations beyond all those virtues that make men chivalrous, brave, and true. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that until the Journal is approved?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will.

The Journal was approved.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the Agricultural appropriation bill. When the House adjourned last night the question pending was, Will the House reconsider the vote by which the seed amendment was rejected? The vote will come on that question first.

The question was being taken, when Mr. LANGLEY made the point that no quorum was present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and as many as are in favor of the motion to reconsider will, as their names are called, vote "aye" and those opposed will vote "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 153, answered "present" 2, not voting 108, as follows:

YEAS—166.

Almon	Fisher	McDuffie	Sisson
Aswell	Flood	McKeown	Slemp
Bacharach	Fordney	McKinley	Small
Bankhead	Ganly	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Barkley	Gard	Mason	Smithwick
Bee	Garner	Mays	Stegall
Bell	Garrett	Miller	Stedman
Benham	Goodall	Minahan, N. J.	Steenerson
Blackmon	Goodykoontz	Moore, Ind.	Stephens, Ohio
Bland, Ind.	Greene, Mass.	Morin	Stevenson
Boies	Griffin	Murphy	Stinness
Bowers	Hadley	Nelson, Mo.	Stoll
Bowling	Hardy, Colo.	Newton, Minn.	Strong, Kans.
Brand	Hardy, Tex.	Newton, Mo.	Summers, Wash.
Briggs	Hastings	Nicholls	Sweet
Brinson	Hays	O'Connor	Taylor, Ark.
Brooks, Ill.	Hickey	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Brooks, Pa.	Houghton	Oliver	Taylor, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Howard	Osborne	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Huddleston	Padgett	Thompson
Campbell, Pa.	Hudspeth	Park	Tillman
Candler	Humphreys	Parker	Timberlake
Caraway	Jacoway	Phelan	Tincher
Carrs	Jeffers	Pou	Valle
Carter	Johnson, Miss.	Quin	Venable
Clark, Fla.	Juul	Raker	Vestal
Classon	Keller	Ramsey	Vinson
Collier	Kendall	Randall, Calif.	Voigt
Crisp	Kiess	Ransley	Watkins
Davey	King	Rayburn	Weaver
Davis, Minn.	Kreider	Rhodes	Welty
Davis, Tenn.	Lampert	Ricketts	White, Kans.
Dent	Langley	Riddick	Wilson, La.
Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Robison, Ky.	Wilson, Pa.
Dominick	Lankford	Rodenberg	Wingo
Doughton	Larsen	Rouse	Woods, Va.
Drane	Layton	Rubey	Wright
Dupré	Lazaro	Sanders, La.	Yates
Dyer	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Sears	Zihlman
Echols	Lehlbach	Sells	
Fields	Longworth	Sims	

NAYS—153.

Ackerman	Burdick	Crowther	Ellsworth
Anderson	Burroughs	Currie, Mich.	Elston
Andrews, Md.	Byrnes, S. C.	Curry, Calif.	Esch
Andrews, Nebr.	Campbell, Kans.	Dale	Evans, Mont.
Anthony	Cannon	Darrow	Evans, Nebr.
Ashbrook	Chindblom	Dempsey	Fairfield
Barbour	Christopherson	Denison	Fess
Benson	Clark, Mo.	Dickinson, Iowa	Fish
Black	Coady	Dowell	Foster
Bland, Va.	Cole	Dunbar	Frear
Blanton	Conrally	Dunn	Freeman
Box	Cooper	Eagan	French
Browne	Crago	Edmonds	Fuller
Buchanan	Cramton	Elliot	Glynn